Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/empireclubofcana1921unse

BRIG.-GENERAL C. H. MITCHELL,
C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., C.E., LL.D.
President of the Empire Club of Canada, 1921.

EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

ADDRESSES DELIVERED TO THE MEMBERS DURING THE YEAR 1921

Nineteenth Year of Issue

CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

GOD SAVE THE KING

T. H. BEST PRINTING CO., LIMITED
TORONTO

COPYRIGHT, CANADA, 1923
THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

T. H. Best Printing Co., Limited
Printers and Bookbinders, Toronto, Canada

CONTENTS

PAGE

OFFICERS, 1921 vi

CONSTITUTION AND PLATFORM vii

AFFILIATION WITH THE ROYAL COLONIAL INSTITUTE . . xiii

J. W. MACMILLAN, B.A., D.D. 1
The Ontario Minimum Wage Bill.

MAJ.-GEN. SIR JOCELYN PERCY, K.B.E., C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O. 14
The Situation in Russia.

RT. HON. SIR GEORGE E. FOSTER, K.C.M.G., D.C.L., LL.D. 31
The League of Nations and the First Assembly at Geneva.

MESSRS. ARTHUR LORD, HENRY TAFT AND WM. B. KELLEN 50
Fraternal Greetings from Uncle Sam.

JACOB G. SCHURMAN, D.Sc., LL.D. 60
Our International Outlook.

JOHN APPLETON STEWART, LL.D. 75
Good Will between the United States and Canada.

J. L. MORISON, M.A. 88
Will Britain Retain India?

ROBSON BLACK 100
Paying our War Debt with Timber Crops.

JOHN MACNAUGHTON, M.A., LL.D. 114
The Old Country Revisited.

JAMES A. EMERY 129
The Open Shop: Why is it? Why should it prevail?

PAGE

RT. HON. CHARLES J. DOHERTY, K.C., D.C.L., LL.D. . 152
The Establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice.

SAMUEL GOMPERS 164
The Open Shop: What is it? Why should it prevail?

SIR JOHN MARTIN HARVEY 182
The Spirit and Cohesion of the Empire.

F. W. FIELD 192
British Industry: Anglo-Canadian and Empire Trade.

RT. HON. J. W. LOWTHER 204
The Mother of Parliaments.

BEN. H. MORGAN, F.R.S.S., M.I.A.E. 215
The Progress of Imperial Preference.

REV. PREBENDARY A. W. GOUGH, M.A., F.R.S.L. . . . 227
Difficulties and Opportunities of the British Empire.

RUSTOM RUSTOMJEE 237
Quo Vadis India?

C. R. FAY, M.A. 252
How Education strengthens the Links of Empire.

SIR ROBERT FALCONER, K.C.M.G., LL.D. 261
Present Conditions in Great Britain.

SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, M.A., D.D., LL.D., F.R.G.S. . . . 278
The Egyptian and Arabian Problems.

WILLIAM T. GRENFELL, C.M.G., M.D., M.R.C.S., LL.D. . 295
The Story of Labrador Medical Mission.

CHARLES T. CURRELLY, M.A. 311
The Present Unrest in Egypt.

THE CLUB ENTERTAINS: 330
His Excellency the Governor-General of Canada, and Lady Byng of Vimy.

PAGE
HON. WALLACE NESBITT, K.C. 331
Canada Within the Empire.

SAMUEL L. JOSHI, M.A. 352
New Forces in Old India.

THE EARL OF CAVAN, K.P., G.C.M.G., K.C.B. 365
Empire Problems of To-day.

BRIG.-GEN. C. H. MITCHELL, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O. . . . 379
A Survey of the Empire: its Problems and Prospects.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE
YEAR 1921

Patron and Honorary President

FIELD-MARSHALL H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND STRATHEARN, K.G., G.C.M.G.

President: Brig.-Gen. C. H. Mitchell, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.
First Vice-President: R. E. Patterson
Second Vice-President: E. H. Wilkinson
Third Vice-President: Lt.-Col. W. G. MacKendrick, D.S.O.

Secretary-Treasurer: D. J. Goggin, M.A., D.C.L.

Committee

Dr A. H. Abbott
Mr. D. A. Balfour
Mr. Frank Bethel
Dr. J. Murray Clark, K.C.
Mr. A. E. Clemes
Mr. W. J. Darby
Dr. P. E. Doolittle
Mr. A. E. Gilverson
Sir William Hearst, K.C.M.G.
Mr. C. M. Horswell
Professor D. R. Keys
Lt.-Col. A. E. Kirkpatrick
Mr. W. E. Lemon
Lt.-Col. R. C. LeVesconte
Mr. S. R. Parsons
Mr. J. B. Sutherland
Mr. A. Monro Grier, K.C.

and

Representatives of the Advisory Council of Past Presidents

Mr. F. J. Coombs
Mr. Arthur Hewitt
Mr. F. B. Featherstonhaugh, K.C.
Mr. R. A. Stapells

CONSTITUTION AND PLATFORM

THE OBJECT OF THE CLUB IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE INTERESTS OF CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

Organization of the Club and Branches

Art. 1.—(1) The organization shall be called The Empire Club of Canada.

(2) Branches of the Club may be established with the authority of the Executive Committee, and subject to such conditions and regulations as may from time to time be decided upon by the Club in Toronto.

(3) A committee may be appointed, under the provisions of sub-section 2, article 1, for the establishment of branches of the Club, and the word "Unit" shall denote a Branch.

Classes of Members

Art. 2.—The membership of the Club shall be open to any man of the full age of eighteen years who is a British subject and shall consist of

(*a*) Active Resident Members.
(*b*) Non-Resident Members.
(*c*) Life Members.
(*d*) Honorary Members.

Active Resident Members and Non-Resident Members

Art. 3—(1) Candidates for membership shall be proposed and seconded by two members of the Club in good standing, and shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meeting of the Executive Committee.

(2) Active resident members shall pay an annual fee of $3.00 and non-resident members $2.00, this fee to include membership, obtained after October fifteenth in any year, till December thirty-first of the following year.

No member in arrears for fees or dues shall be considered to be in good standing, or to be eligible for office.

Life Members

Art. 4.—(1) Life Members, not exceeding ten in any one year, may be elected from time to time, at an open meeting of the Club, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Provided, however, that Ministers of the Federal Parliament and Premiers of the different Provinces of the Dominion of Canada may be eligible for election as Life Members at any time, even though their election may cause the number of Life Members to exceed ten in one year.

(2) Life members shall pay a fee of $50.00 in one sum.

Honorary Members

Art. 5.—(1) Honorary Members may be elected, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and at a general meeting of the Club.

(2) Honorary Members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

Officers to be Elected

Art. 6.—(1) The officers of the Club shall consist of an Honorary President; a President; First, Second and Third Vice-President; a Treasurer, a Secretary, or a Secretary-Treasurer; and seventeen other members, all of whom shall be elected by ballot. These members together with the officers before mentioned, shall constitute the Executive Committee, and shall hold office throughout the calendar year. All Past Presidents of the Club shall constitute an Advisory Council under the Chairmanship of the immediate Past President, and such Advisory Council shall elect annually three members, who, together with the retiring President, shall be ex-officio members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year.

Election of Officers

(2) The Election of officers of the Club shall take place at a general meeting of the members to be held not later than December 15th of each year, at a date to be decided upon by the Executive Committee, and this meeting shall be deemed to be the Annual Meeting. A committee to nominate the officers for the new year shall be appointed at the meeting next preceding such Annual Meeting, due notice of such meeting to be given to all members in good standing, and such committee shall report to the Annual Meeting; provided that no member shall be nominated to any office unless and until he has given notice in writing that he consents to such nomination and will act if elected to the position for which he has been nominated.

(3) Two Auditors shall be elected at each Annual Meeting.

Standing Committees

(4) Standing Committees shall be appointed as follows:—

(*a*) Finance Committee.
(*b*) Speakers' Committee.
(*c*) Membership Committee.
(*d*) Constitution Committee.
(*e*) Luncheon and Reception Committee.
(*f*) Publicity Committee.
(*g*) Royal Colonial Institute Committee.

Filling of Vacancies among Officers

Art. 7.—In the event of an office becoming vacant by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thus caused shall be filled by the Executive Committee, and the person so chosen shall hold office until the next Annual Meeting.

Duties of Officers

Art. 8.—The duties of the officers shall be those customary to such positions in similar organizations.

Holding of Meetings

Art. 9.—(1) The Club shall hold general meetings weekly from October to May, both inclusive, in each twelve months with such intermission as from time to time may be decided upon.

(2) At the Annual Meeting a report of the year's proceedings and work shall be submitted by the President, and this report shall be accompanied by an interim report from the Treasurer. As the financial year does not end until December 31st, the Treasurer shall, in addition to the interim report presented at the Annual Meeting, present an audited statement of the finances of the Club for the full financial year at any regular meeting of the Club held during the month of January.

Notice of Meetings

Art. 10.—Written or printed notices of all meetings shall be given to the members of the Club. Such notices shall be sufficient if addressed to the members, and deposited post paid in the post office in Toronto.

Quorum at Meetings

Art. 11—Fifteen members in good standing shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Club, general, annual, or special, and the presiding officer shall have a casting vote. Six members shall form a quorum of the Executive Committee.

Limitation of Business at General Meetings

Art. 12.—No business other than the hearing of the address and notice of motions shall be introduced at any meeting of the Club, unless it has been submitted to the Executive Committee and received its approval.

Calling of Special Meetings

Art. 13.—Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be called by the President, or on a requisition signed by three of its members. Special meetings of the Club may be called by the President, and shall be called by him on a requisition signed by twelve members and stating the object of the meeting. This object shall be stated in the notice calling the special meeting.

Financial Year

Art. 14.—The Financial Year shall be the same as the calendar year, viz.: January first to December thirty-first.

Amendments to Constitution

Art. 15—This Constitution may be amended at the Annual Meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, subject to a two-thirds majority vote of the members present.

EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA
TORONTO

Amended Platform of Principles and Objects for which the Empire Club of Canada stands

1. That, as hitherto, the main object of the Empire Club of Canada is the advancement of the interests of Canada, and a United Empire.

2. That the term British should apply to all citizens of the Empire.

3. That the Empire should be so organized that Canada and the other self-governing Dominions should be given a share in the control of its destinies, particularly in matters of peace and war.

4. That the different parts of the Empire should contribute to the cost of its defence, in such manner and amount as may be properly determined by a Convention called by the Parliaments of the Empire.

5. That in Imperial organization there should be preserved to the several self-governing Dominions their autonomy and the control of all local as distinguished from Imperial matters.

6. That Canadian public Lands should be given free to citizens who have fought, or enlisted to fight, in the armies, navies and air forces of the Empire and who express a desire for farm life—a condition of such grant to be actual settlement and cultivation by the donee; and that an equivalent recognition should be given to such soldiers as desire to follow other occupations.

7. That all articles of growth, produce or manufacture within the component parts of the Empire should be given preferential advantages in the respective markets of the Empire, and that measures should be adopted to prevent any of the Empire's resources being utilized to injure British interests.

8. That a proper system of physical and military training should be introduced in the schools, colleges and universities throughout the Dominion of Canada.

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

GOVERNING THE AFFILIATION OF

THE ROYAL COLONIAL INSTITUTE

AND

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

1. That the Royal Colonial Institute and the Empire Club of Canada be affiliated with a view to mutually promoting the object for which both were founded, namely, the Unity of the Empire.

2. That members of the Empire Club of Canada introduced by the Secretary of the Club, on recording their arrival in England, to the Secretary of the Royal Colonial Institute, be made Honorary Fellows for one month.

3. That residents in the Dominion of Canada may become non-resident Fellows of the Royal Colonial Institute and Members of the Empire Club of Canada on being duly proposed and seconded, and on payment of an Entrance Fee of One Guinea (Five Dollars) and an Annual Subscription of Twenty-five Shillings, (Six Dollars) for which they will receive the Journal of the Institute "United Empire" free of charge, and, when in London, have the use of the Institute Building as a Standing Address. This subscription will cover membership of both the Club and the Institute, and shall be allotted to the Institute and the Club in the proportion of three dollars and fifty cents to the former, and two dollars and fifty cents to the latter.

4. That all publications of the Empire Club of Canada shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Royal Colonial Institute as soon as published, and each Member of the Institute, so desiring, shall be entitled to a copy of the annual volume of the Empire Club Proceedings and Addresses for the sum of seventy-five cents, or three shillings.

5. That the Monthly Journal of the Royal Colonial Institute, "United Empire," shall be supplied to the Members of the Empire Club of Canada who are *not* Fellows of the Royal Colonial Institute at an Annual Subscription of One Dollar, including postage, the ordinary subscription being one shilling per copy or twelve shillings a year exclusive of postage.

6. That the Financial Year of the Empire Club be the same as the Calendar Year, viz.—January first to December thirty-first.

7. That the Joint-Life-Subscription for new Non-Resident Fellows of the Institute and Members of the Empire Club be $65 (£13.1.0) ; $45 (£9.1.0) of which is payable to the Institute and includes an entrance fee of $5 (£1.1.0) ; and $20 (£4.) payable to the Empire Club.

Received and adopted by the Empire Club of Canada, October 17, 1918.

JOINT FEES

AS IN ARTICLES 3 AND 7 ABOVE

ANNUAL FEE			LIFE FEE			
TOTAL	DISTRIBUTION		TOTAL	DISTRIBUTION		
Dollars	E. C.	R. C. I.		E. C.	R. C. I.	
$6.00	$2.50	$3.50	$65.00	$20.00	$45.00	Includes $ 5.00 (£1 1s.) Initiation Fee for R. C. I.
Sterling						
£1 5s.	£0 10s.	£0 15s.	£13 1s.	£4	£9 1s.	
			$60.00	$20.00	$40.00	For present members who have already paid R. C. I. Initiation.
			£12	£4	£8	

The Object of the Club is
the Advancement of the Interests of
Canada and a United Empire

THE ONTARIO MINIMUM WAGE BILL

An Address by PROF. J. W. MacMILLAN, BA., D.D.

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, January 13, 1921

The Lord Bishop of Toronto, as past President, introduced the new President, Brigadier-General Mitchell, as an ideal man who was with us in the war, and is now an ideal man in peace.

BRIG.-GEN. MITCHELL

Your Lordship, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I assure you it is a proud moment when I stand at my first meeting as President of the Empire Club of Canada. I want to thank you all for the honour you did me just before Christmas in electing me to this honourable position. I am proud to be the President of the Empire Club. (Applause) I have always felt, and I am sure you will agree with me, that Toronto is the most pro-British city on the continent of America. (Applause) That means a great deal, and we Torontonians and we Canadians are ever feeling more proud of being a part of the Empire. Not long ago I had a letter from a friend of mine who is one of the under-secretaries in the government of Britain, and speaking of the Empire and growth of the Empire, particularly in these days, he said that while London, the old home of the government of

---

Rev. J. W. MacMillan, B.A. D.D., is professor of Sociology in Victoria College and Chairman of the Ontario Minimum Wage Board established in 1920. He had been Chairman of the Minimum Wage Commission for Manitoba and Chairman of the Manitoba Industrial Conditions Commission.

the Empire, will always be the heart of Empire, yet in order to make the Empire what it is destined to be there must be other hearts of Empire around the Globe. And then he said that he knew, as the people over there know, that Toronto—particularly Toronto—was considered to be a heart of Empire. Now, we must not arrogate to ourselves in Toronto this business of being the heart of the Empire; but Toronto is the great centre of the Pro-British, pro-Empire spirit which permeates Canada. We have, particularly at this time in 1921, problems which are before the Empire as an Empire. More than anything alse just now, we have the problem of unemployment, which involves the problem of the relationship of the worker to the employer. The problem of our industries and of our commercial and trade life is a thing above everything else to which we must turn our attention. That, perhaps more than anything else, is the *raison d'etre* for our starting on our first meeting this year with the subject of wages, because it lies at the foundation of the problem before us in the reconstruction and the revival of the Empire's business. To-day we have been fortunate in getting Dr. MacMillan, Professor of Sociology in the University, to come to us and tell us about the work of the Ontario Minimum Wage Board. As you know, Professor MacMillan is an expert on this subject not only as the problem presents itself to-day, but he has been giving a great deal of attention to this for years past; and with his very excellent corps, most of whom are here to-day, with the female members, whom we are very proud indeed to have with us. (Applause) They have arrived at some general conclusions, I hope, at any rate general suggestions, of which they can give us the benefit. I will now call on Professor MacMillan to address you on this subject.

PROF. MACMILLAN

Mr. President, Your Lordship, Members of the Empire Club, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I count it a privilege to be permitted to tell you something of what minimum wage legislation means, and of the purpose and anticipations of the recently-formed Board in the Province of Ontario. I thank you all, not only for myself, but for my associates on that Board, all of whom are present to-day, for this opportunity, and for the cordial expression which you have just given in your greeting to us. We hope that we may deserve something of this, and that when we lay our armour off we may dwell as kindly in your memory as we do now in your anticipation.

The principle underneath minimum wage laws is a very simple one. It is the principle of the right to live. Minimum wage laws do not fix wages; they content themselves with drawing a certain line—the minimum wage line—below which wages may not fall. They fix this line, not by enquiry as to the productivity of the labourer or the solvency or profitableness of the business, but in accordance with the needs of human nature—the presumption being that the worker has the right to live from his work. It is owing to the simplicity of this principle, to the convincing, the compelling quality that is in this principle, that minimum wage boards, the world over, have been able to work so harmoniously both with employers and employees, and have generally won the good-will of human society.

If you think of it, it is that same principle that underlies our stringent law against murder; for the essential criminality in murder is not destruction, but psychology. It is not the shedding of blood, the shedding of useful blood; it is the shedding of precious blood, the blood of a human being, the shedding of sacred blood, the blood of the only essentially sacred creature—that can be seen, at least—on earth. I suppose that if I killed somebody I should be hanged; and yet I think I might make the rather specious plea that if it were not for this principle, I might have liberty to assassinate a human being and yet escape. I might select, for instance, some decrepit and invalid and aged person, and I might plead that I had robbed him only of a very few years; yea, that I had but delivered him from the burden of his existence.

I might even claim reward rather than penalty for my deed. I might kill a baby; I might kill a willing criminal; but the law would make no distinction. Old or young, rich or poor, useful or useless, good or bad, killing is murder I suppose that if there were a felon in a condemned cell to be hanged to-morrow morning, and I broke my way into that cell and strangled him in his dreamless sleep, I would stand some chance of taking his place upon the scaffold, though I had but anticipated the sentence of the law by a few hours. That is the meaning of murder—the right to live; a right essential, inherent, supreme, unquestionable—so that any outrage upon that right is a capital offence. The question of accidents, decretals, incidentals, appurtenances upon that is a very trifling question. The question is, did he or did he not kill a human being?

This is the way in which this law applies. There is no compulsion upon any employer to hire any individual person whatever, but the compulsion is that if any employer does employ an individual, takes from that one his or her productive energy, in return for that shall be given at least enough for that person to live on. That is all; and upon that this law is erected; because, you see, the principle applies not only to the earnings of life but the continuing of life. It is unfit that any human being should be voluntarily robbed of life. It is also unfit that any human being possessed of this precious and sacred treasure of human life should live in meanness, in penury, in hardship, in torment, unless these things be perceivably for disciplinary or retaliatory purposes imposed upon that life by the official sentence of organized society. We may except criminals; and yet in the particular in which we are concerned in connection with the minimum wage law we do not. We give the fellow who is going to be hanged this morning his breakfast. Our paupers in the poor-house are supposed to be sufficiently fed, sheltered and clothed. The whole army of dependents and defectives, the insane, the deaf and dumb, the blind and the defective and the incapable, we house these in institutions. We demand that the standard of living in those institutions should be a modest standard indeed, but yet should be the standard of reasonable comfort. And, in the industrial order, society in general makes that same modest demand. Here are these workers organized into industrial groups, industrial families. The demand is made of those that are in control of those industrial families that they shall provide the members of those families with enough to eat, enough to wear, enough to shelter, and a decent and reasonable allowance of wholesome comforts and recreations. As you know very well, there is a controversy in the world to-day as to whether or not the existing industrial order is an advantage and should be maintained, and the argument for its continued existence is that it does these things measurably well. Its strongest argument is that it has actually succeeded in providing for the needs of human life, whereas it is a questionable matter as to whether any of the proposed alternatives—none of them having been put to the test of experiment—will be even so moderately successful. As it is in Hamlet, "we rather bear the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of." No man defends our industrial order on the ground that it makes a few men rich. He may defend, and it is often defended, by saying that it is by pursuing that motive that a larger benefit for a larger number is reached; but the obligation is upon the management, the head of each family, that he shall provide for his own.

In the business world there is strong criticism for the man that pays his dividends out of his assets. There will be stronger criticism for the man that pays dividends out of, not financial but vital assets. There is criticism and there is destruction for the business that is financially insolvent, but it is at least possible that a business may be financially solvent but humanly insolvent. Service is the only justification for profit.

There is an old book that some of you may perhaps have read, that says, "if a man will not work, neither shall he eat." It is an excellent principle. It implies the principle of its converse—that if a man will work he shall eat, and shall eat the bread of independence and self-support. Nothing should interfere with the operation of that wise law, whether viewed directly or viewed conversely. And the minimum wage law just says that "if this woman", for it applies only to women in Canada, "if this woman gives you her work, you may give her as much more as you like—we have nothing to do with that—but after she has attained maturity and maintained skill so that you get the full product of her labour, you shall at least give her enough so that she shall have enough to eat and to wear, and have a decent roof over her head, with a few comforts besides." That is the modest, simple and incontrovertible principle of the minimum wage. It works within a limited area—for as you have already seen it is not an attempted solution of the great problem of the industrial order; for instance, it does not touch the question of unemployment; it does not touch the exchange problem; it does not touch any of the greater problems; it confines itself to this one limited area. Men would be at each other's throats if you brought up these other questions; but we find it quite possible to work harmoniously within this area. This is a long speech, and I am a long man (laughter) and the business that I have spent my long life in has somewhat muscularized my capacity for talking and I do not wish to unduly prolong this gathering of the Empire Club. (Go on!) Oh, I intend to say some more; don't think you are going to get away (laughter), I am just wondering what I should say .

Should I attempt to give you some history of the way in which this legislation has developed from the time it was first suggested in New Zealand in 1884—then in Australia, then in Britain, then in the United States, and at last the way it has spread, with variations, through Canada? I think I had better set that to one side. Shall I attempt to tell you a little of the practical experience that I have had as chairman for several years of the first Minimum Wage Board in Canada, that in the Province of Manitoba? Perhaps I might say a little about that. (Hear, hear) In Manitoba, which is now a strongly industrialized province, there are somewhere about 6,000 women in industry outside of domestic service and agriculture. I understand that in Ontario there are 14,000 factories, and each one of them has a certain number of employees. The number of female employees in Ontario I cannot begin to guess, but I surmise that it is a very considerable number indeed. Moreover, the industries in Manitoba are practically hived within the city of Winnipeg, whereas the women-employing industries of Ontario are scattered as far as Ottawa in the east, Windsor in the west, and I do not know how far north; so that the problem here in Ontario is immensely larger than it was in Manitoba. Yet I think the small experience I had in Manitoba does shed some illustrative light upon the problem in Ontario.

We were appointed in Manitoba as this Board is appointed in Ontario; the two acts are somewhat different, but they are in many respects alike. A lady and a gentleman were appointed as representing the employers, and a lady and gentleman were appointed as representating the employees ,and we held our first meeting and introduced ourselves to each other, for there had been but the very slightest acquaintance between any two members of that Board. The question came up immediately, in what way shall we proceed?—for the act left it entirely to our own choice. We enquired of some experts in the matter and the advice given to us did not convince us very much at the start. I won't take time to retail it—and our further experience has taken it still further from any possibility of convincing us. We were told, in fact, that we should act strongly; that that was the essential thing. "Put your notices up in the factories and tell them that if they don't keep this Act they will get into trouble." We did not do that.

First of all we looked at each other, and we felt that we could trust each other. (Laughter) Industrial things got pretty well excited at times. One member of the Board was the leader of the strike in Winnipeg, and the other was recently elected Mayor of Winnipeg; so you see we hadn't any tame cats on that Board. (Laughter) Now, I saw personally an opportunity for great personal aggrandizement. I was myself sitting on the fence, with a leg on either side, and the employers' representatives near my right leg and the employees' representatives near my left. I saw each question coming up, and these two cancelling the votes of the other two, and I doing the whole business of the Board. (Laughter) Wasn't it a magnificent prospect? However, somehow I was not attracted to that prospect. The smaller the man, as you know, the more militaristic he is. (Laughter) It seemed to me, moreover, that each decision from our Board went out with two members of the Board opposed to it. In the one case those two had the artillery of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, with all its wealth and power joined with them; or in the other case they had all the artillery of the Labour Temple with all its power of press and speech and union. So that, however, our legal authority might run, our moral authority might not be very great. We all saw that point, and we decided that if possible we would try and be harmonious in the Board. I presided over I don't know how many meetings of that Board,—they lasted for about two years—and I only remember one occasion where I actually had to settle by my casting vote a question where there was a distinct and sharp controversy between the two representatives of capital and the two representatives of labour. (Applause)

We went a little further. Reports came to us, as they are coming to us now, of industries in which the wages are supposedly below the standard of decent living—perhaps not prevailingly so, but to a considerable extent—and we set ourselves to deal with those industries. We made our investigation, and then we sought representatives from the employers' side and from the employees' side to meet with us, and they sat around our long Board table, and we explained to them what this Act meant, and we said to these employers, "Do you believe in this principle?" They said, "Yes" We held some forty of those conferences, and every time we met with a body of employers and explained the principle to them they said, "Yes, we believe in that; we want to do that." We said, "Well, then, let us take the thing up."

Now, in Manitoba, we had authority over working conditions and over hours and over wages. Here in Ontario we have that only over wages, and as I said, not wages, but the minimum line below which wages may not be allowed to fall. So we went over those items one by one, and we said, "Now, we would like to do what is reasonable and fair, what will help business if possible, and at the same time carry out this principle of the minimum wage for the worker." So we dealt plainly with those points one by one. We said: "The responsibility is on the Board; if necessary we will go ahead and do this thing, make it law and enforce it, but we would much rather have your approval and agreement."

Gentlemen, in those forty conferences I remember only one or two occasions—and there it was in regard to some less important matter—in which objection was made either on the side of the employer or the employee. We managed to reach agreements, and we found ourselves supported by the sympathy, accord, and business knowledge and ability of the employers of Manitoba; and I look forward with confidence to the operation of the Minimum Wage Board in Ontario with every expectation that we shall receive the same sympathy and support. (Applause)

There are some reasons why I am able to indulge that confident expectation I read the Factory Act of Ontario, and I find that there is nothing in the law to prevent an employer of labour in Ontario demanding 60 hours per week work from his employees; yet I find that the more general week is 48 hours; yea, that not an uncommon week is 44 hours. Now, that argues well for the manufacturers as a class; and other indications there are of the same sort—the way in which the organized body of manufacturers of this Province has so far regarded the enactment of this legislation; so that we believe they intend to give us a fair show in the carrying of this law into effect.

There are just one or two matters which I see raised now and again by way of objection, which you might like me to deal with briefly. One is that the minimum wage becomes a maximum, that when it represents those that are low it depresses those that are high, so that the gain of the low-paid woman is the loss of the high-paid woman. I want to argue that on a theoretical basis, but I wish to tell you this fact—that in over thirty years operation of the Minimum Wage Acts in the antipodes, Great Britain, and the United States and Canada, that has never been found to be the case. Women's wages do not follow the same plan as men's wages, largely no doubt because men are so much organized and women are so little organized. In collective bargaining the minimum wage is commonly the maximum wage, but in carrying out the Minimum Wage Board regulations it has not been found so. The tendency rather is that in lifting the wage scale from the bottom it is lifted more or less all the way up, through not lifted in the same degree, at the same time that it is lifted above. That is the fact, and what has happened in Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, Manitoba and Massachusetts, U. S. A., is not likely to be contradicted by experience in Ontario.

Another objection, and one that probably deals more with the body of gentlemen who are listening to me today, is the peril of inter-provincial competition. Whereever you go, if you go to some place where lower wages are paid and if the wages that are paid here are made still higher, then we will be unable, they say, to meet the competition from those other Provinces where an extremely low wage is paid. Gentlemen, that is an ancient objection which has been produced whenever any social or factory legislation whatever was suggested—the Workmen's Compensation, and all those Acts that trail away back to the middle of the 19th Century for shortening the hours of labour, improving working conditions, limiting the ages of child labour, women labour, night labour; every one of those has had to meet that objection. Those laws have been imposed; hours have been shortened; conditions have been made better and more extensive; these things have been done again, and that forboding has not been vindicated; industry has steadily improved in the places where the conditions have been improved.

I want to mention one or two other things. I have said that women's wages do not follow the same law as men's wages. They do not follow the same law as men's wages in regard to standardization. You talk as if there was one prevailing woman's wage for Ontario and another for Quebec, another for the Maritime Provinces, and another for Manitoba. There is no such thing. There is no standard woman's wage for this City of Toronto. You know your own businesses, but you don't know the wages your neighbour is paying. But where returns are gathered, as they are necessarily gathered for such purposes as our Minimum Wage Board is devoted to, it is shown that there will be two factories buying material in the same market and selling their products in the same market, so that you cannot tell one from the other from anything you can observe; yet you will find the wage set in one, ten, twenty or thirty per cent. perhaps, below or above that of the other. I have not yet seen wage sheets in Toronto, and I expect to see them soon, but I have no doubt that that is the condition of affairs in Toronto and in the Province of Ontario. It is no exception to the condition that reigns throughout the rest of the world that is organized in industry. The comparison between one province and another is a comparison that cannot be satisfactorily made. There may, indeed, be some trifling differences, but the difference will not be very much more than that between one factory and another; and the surprising thing is that very generally a factory that pays the highest wages is the factory that makes the biggest profit.

Another thing is this, that the proportion of the cost of any product that goes to wages is much less than many people suppose. In the census of manufacturers for the Dominion of Canada for the year 1917 the proportion that went to wages—not wages and salaries, but wages—was somewhere around fifteen to sixteen per cent. The very careful survey made in New York City some years ago showed that the proportion ran all the way from four per cent. up to fifty per cent. In the sugar refining it was about four per cent.; in making steel sleeping cars it was about fifty per cent., but most ran around twelve, seventeen, or up to twenty-five per cent. Now, what does that mean? That if you increase wages ten per cent. when wages were one-fifth of the cost of production, you only increase the cost of production by two per cent. That is a very important thing; and it was found, and is in the published report of the investigating commission of the State of New York, that at that time the girls working in the candy factories in New York State for instance, were getting an average wage of $5.82. Now, suppose that wage had been increased so that they had received a minimum wage of $8.00—which was thought a fair minimum a few years ago in New York State—not from the average to an average, or from the minimum to a minimum, but from the average to a minimum—the increase of well over $2.00 a week on the average wage—how much do you suppose it would have necessarily added to the price of candy? Not one half cent a pound. That is perhaps a stronger illustration than many that might be advanced, but that is really and essentially the situation; and it is quite possible to increase wages within a reasonable limit without making any very considerable increase in the necessary cost of the product. I recognize I have many men before me that are experts in cost accounting, but the public generally are not cognizant of the fact mentioned.

But now, Gentlemen, I must close, with much regret, for it is a great pleasure to have as attentive a gathering as there is here to-day, and a gathering that is evidently much interested in this subject, which is of course one of very great importance to us now that we are on the threshold of our activity as representating the authority of the people of the Province of Ontario. I recognize that this gathering to-day is a gathering rather of the employers than of the employees. I have spoken on this subject in the Labor Temple in this city, and may perhaps speak there again. I told them, and will tell them, the same story I told here, but the appeal that follows the story is evidently a little different. Among the employers there is, as there is to be found in any class of human beings whatever, a certain small number that are of an unworthy type—sweater employers you might call them, shyster employers—men that will take the last, and more too, out of their workers, men that do not think of the human side, men to whom wages in their balance sheet has no more significance than insurance, men that care nothing for their employees except to get all they can from them and return to them as little as possible. Now, may I point out to you that minimum wage laws are a great protection for the better-class employer against unfair competition from the shyster employer? and on that rather low ground—that ground of self-interest—I make a confident appeal for the support of the better class of employers throughout this province. But I should rest it more strongly on the more generous human ground of the common right to live, and of the worker's right to live from her work. (Loud applause)

PRES. MITCHELL: I am sure we are very much indebted to Prof. MacMillan for his most excellent address on this most interesting subject, and I am sure that we owe him our cordial thanks for coming here to-day and speaking as he has done.

THE SITUATION IN RUSSIA

AN ADDRESS BY MAJOR-GENERAL SIR JOCELYN PERCY, K.B.E., C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, January 27, 1921

PRES. MITCHELL: *Gentlemen,*—We have with us a very eminent British General, the most distinguished of what I may call the younger generals; in fact, though I ought not to say this, he is of my own age. (Laughter) I knew General Percy very well indeed in the days when, in 1916 and 1917, we were fighting in France, and although I never had the pleasure and the honour of working on the same staff, or working under him, I worked alongside of him, and I know what kind of man he is, not only as a man but as a General; and he was such a good man and such a good General that he was selected by Lord Plumer to be his Chief of Staff, following Sir Chas. Harrington in the second army, which took part in the final offensive in parts of Germany, and occupied the Rhine. (Applause) Those of you of the Canadian corps—and I see many buttons here—will probably remember General Percy as the tall gentleman who stood beside Lord Plumer on a bright day at dawn when the Canadians crossed into Germany for the first time, so he is not really a stranger to you. After the Armistice and in the year 1919 General Percy was selected by the War Office to go to South Russia to take charge of the British Mission, to work with Generals Denekin and Wrangel, and in that capacity he had an extraordinarily good opportunity to see the conditions in Russia, and particularly in South Russia. It is on this subject that he is going to speak to us to-day. I am sure you will all agree with me how very glad and proud we are that General Percy is coming to Canada to be a Canadian and to be one of us. (Applause) He has brought with him his wife and two children, who are going to be real good Canadians. (Hear, hear) General Percy is going out to British Columbia to engage in the apple business, and you may expect before long to hear of his product on this side and on the other side of the water. It is a very great pleasure to introduce him to you.

SIR JOCELYN PERCY

My Lord, and Gentlemen,—I do not set up to be a speaker at all; I have simply been a soldier all my life, and General Mitchell told me that you were a very patient people and that if I would just say in simple language what I could about Russia you would forgive any mistakes and bad oratory that I would make. (Applause) Well, I cannot tell you how proud and pleased I am with the wonderful reception you have given me here to-day, and with all the friends and people I have met in Toronto; and I feel it a great honour to be asked to speak before the Empire Club. I also consider it a great honour and privilege to have met Colonel Denison, who, I hear, was one of the founders of this magnificent Club. (Applause) I had not very much chance of seeing the Canadians in France, because they never came very much my way, but I made very great friends with many Canadians, I hope life friends, but I had not the honour of serving with them in the defence of the Rhine. I was once there on the occasion of the march over the bridge at dawn, and I saw what magnificent men they were, and knew well what a magnificent part they played in the war, and I feel very proud indeed to come out here to belong to Canada and be a Canadian myself. (Applause)

Now, as regards Russia, we very seldom hear much about the part that Russia played. I was sent out by the War Office in 1907, just after the Russia-Japanese war, and was in Archangel three months studying the battle-fields, and I was able then pretty well to gauge the value of the Russians. They were hopelessly bad in every attempt, and got throroughly beaten by the Japanese; so when this great war started I did not think that the Russians could possibly be of any use, or pull any weight in it. I did not think they would have had time after the Japanese War to put their homes in order, but they came to the scratch in a most marvellous manner. They were an enormous nation and had an enormous army, but they were ill-equipped, many of the soldiers having no arms at all, so that many of them were put into the battle with sticks. Those of you who know what the Germans are will judge that such men were not of much use. However, those men went in, and no doubt before the revolution they pulled their weight, and in an extraordinary manner helped to retain a lot of German divisions in the east which might otherwise have come to the western front.

Then we had what is known as Karensky's revolution, which was bound to come some day in Russia. That country is divided into two distinct classes, one very rich and the other very poor—the rich highly educated, the poor with no education at all. The consequence was that the poor, the moujiks as they call them, the people of the country, were very much downtrodden, and they had what one would call a rough life. Their one idea was to get as much vodka as possible to drink, and they had no pleasure, no happiness in life; so there was bound to be a revolution sometime. However, they chose an unfortunate moment to start the revolution—in the middle of a war—if they wanted to help the Allies. Of course you know that that revolution was started by the Germans. It was part of their game to try and break up Russia and thus release their divisions and armies from the eastern and put them on the western front. This Karensky revolution was well engineered, but it did not pull off as they expected it to do. Then we had the second revolution, which is the exact one that is going on at present under Kolchack. Under the Kolchack revolution there was no law and no order anywhere. The consequence was that the whole army broke up, and they were fighting against each other and against anybody they came across, and they were all out for loot—every man out for himself and doing what he could for himself. The consequence was that those German divisions and armies were released and did come to the western front, and they massed against us, and in March, 1918, was the big battle. That second revolution, again, was backed up by Germany, and they achieved their objects in breaking up Russia for their own benefit and general betterment.

Some very gallant fellows came out of that second revolution, and among others we have General Alexiev, General Kornilof, General Denekin and General Wrangel—those four working in south Russia. We had Admiral Kolchack working in east Russia, and General Judenitch working from the Baltic. With them were enormous numbers of volunteers, and there came out a lot of Russian officers of the old army and a lot of educated people that were all determined to play the game and stick to the Allies, whether there was a revolution or not, because they had promised to work for them. To make a long story short, all those various commanders with their armies finally failed to break down the Bolshevists, and my own impression is that the reason was that there was no cohesion, no concerted movement, no organization in the north, east and south, and as a consequence of never working together, they failed.

I propose to speak of matters in South Russia of which I was an eye-witness. A great number of the people of other countries had missions to those different peoples, but we in England decided to put our money on the southern lot. The Mission went out there soon after the Armistice was declared—General Brooks first of all, a military man. It eventually was taken over by General Holman in July, 1919, and the Mission was greatly increased, growing eventually to 500 British Officers and 2,000 men. Their job was furnishing organization and equipment, clothing, etc., to the army forces of South Russia, as they were called, and also training the men in the various branches—artillery, machine-guns, etc. That was their job

The little extraordinary affairs of South Russia started this way. General Alexiev, General Kornilof and General Denekin came out of the revolution. They were in the Bolshevists' hands, but they got out somehow or other, and after a few efforts they formed a sort of league in South Russia. They originally numbered about sixty or seventy; they had no uniform or arms, nothing whatever. However, they got together, without any arms at all, rushed some Bolshevists and took their arms and things off them and equipped themselves. With that small number and small organization they took a broken corps and got some arms off them. Finally they got arms from peasants who wanted to stick to the Allies, and finally this army grew like a snowball, and in September, 1919, it had grown from sixty to 250,000. They had lost, in killed, very nearly as many, and those thus lost were the best, because all the people who came out were educated people and old-time officers, and they formed themselves into battalions, companies, etc. So when a battalion went into action and lost, say 500 men, they lost 500 officers, or intelligent people. Mixed up with those were the Cossacks, that particular class of people in Southern Russia living about the Don River and valley, hence they are called Don Cossacks, Astrakans, etc They are all farmers, mounted men who live on the horse. They are wonderfully fine riders, and I think good fighters so long as things are going fairly well; but there is not much discipline—that is the trouble with them.

Well, by October or November, 1919, with our help and the arms and ammunition, etc., we had given them, Denekin had advanced on a very wide front. He had done a wonderful thing, having cleared the whole of the Southern part of Russia, an enormous amount of country, with the Volga on his right, and he had got within 200 miles of Moscow. They had started with only a few men; he had raised that large volunteer army, and it was hoped he would have got on and taken Moscow, which would have been a big thing.

I must tell you that the Bolshevists are known there as the Red Guards, but the volunteer army, that is, the Denekin-Alexiev lot, are known as the White Guards. General Alexiev died from exposure during this severe fighting, and General Kornilof himself was killed, so that Denekin assumed command of the army. Those Cossacks are not capable of any discipline, and Denekin, I am sorry to say, is not a strict enough man to put confidence into his army. When his army advanced he was welcomed by the peasants everywhere in the most enthusiastic manner, but after a bit those Cossacks got loose and did an enormous amount of looting. The consequence was that the peasants got rather sick of this, and fought with Denekin's army, which had really showed that the Cossacks were not better than the Bolshevists themselves. The peasants found that their life was no happier under that army than it was under the Bolshevist regime. So a lot of those people, really brigands, rose up behind Denekin, and other bands of serious people who meant business got together. They were not Bolshevists; they did not want the Bolshevists at all, and hated the sight of them, but they also hated Denekin's army, who, they said, were looters as bad as the Bolshevists. These Green Guards became a very formidable people. I know that at the post where I was you could not go outside of the town without being shot at; so what with those Bolshevists, the Red Guards in front, and the Green Guards, those brigands, behind us, the army was having a very bad time. Communications were cut behind; provisions were stolen; our train was derailed once in our journey every day; and it was very uncomfortable. It used to take us about fifteen hours to get eighteen miles. The engine went over the rails, and we unhitched it and got another and went on.

About November, 1919, the Bolshevists attacked pretty severely along the front, and Denekin's army began to retire. The troops in front got fearful for the lines of communication. They were not getting up their stores of supplies and things because of those Green Guards; so they got their wounded up and the retreat began, and once the retreat began they came along at a pretty handy rate. The retreat was due to the Green Guards behind, to the Cossacks deserting, to the Bolshevic propaganda, and to the desertion of Denekin's own troops.

The reason of the desertion was this; the Bolshevists are Jews, and the Bolshevists' leaders are all Jews, and most of them German Jews, out for their own ends. They have German names, but change them to Russian names Their propaganda was this; when the Bolshevists came into a village, if the men were not in the village their wives and children had their throats cut. I saw that with my own eyes. If a man deserted and got back to his village, he was forced by the Bolshevists to fight for them; if he did not fight he was shot; so you can imagine it was not a very pleasant country to live in. In that country at the present moment there is absolutely a reign of terror, far worse than ever it was in the Czar's time. There is no light, there is no air, and it is every man for himself, and indeed they go to bed at night and know they are going to wake up in the morning under the same conditions. In addition to the propaganda and cruelty they carried on, the Bolshevists had a torture chamber. They used to lead out a certain number of victims and torture them just to let the others know what they might get if they did not obey the Bolshevist orders. One kind of torture was that they would put people in a gallery, like this hall, without rifles, and put fellows with rifles on top; they would say to the victims, "Now, you see what is going to happen; we are busy now; you can run about till 5 o'clock; go and run about, and come back and be shot." In addition to this, they are most appalling liars. It is impossible to believe them in anything, because a Bolshevist will promise anything. He is the greatest liar in this world; no greater.

About December, 1919, I was sent by the War Office to go out to Russia as Chief-of-Staff of General Holman, who was commanding out there. I went through

Constantinople and the Black Sea. I touched Odessa and Crimea and fetched up at a place called Novorossisk on the Black Sea. The weather conditions out there for fighting are something appalling. It is very cold and the thermometer below zero with lots of snow on the ground. I never in my life came across anything like the wind at this particular place. When you went out if you did not hold on to the door the wind would knock you absolutely over; that is a fact It was most extraordinarily cold. I have seen the ships in the harbour with four feet of ice on the side, from the waves hitting up on the side of the ship and freezing on it. That place, Novorossisk, was packed with refugees, women and children who had walked from several other parts of Russia, and they were not fed. We had them in our house, and the soldiers of Novorossisk and most of our soldiers were sleeping in trenches and places in the perishing cold in order to make room for those women and children. (Applause)

The train coming down country bearing refugees from the north during this retreat were simply packed with people. I have seen twenty or thirty trains standing in stations, with no engines to take them out, amidst extraordinary cold and conditions perfectly dreadful. The hospitals did all they could for them; we had not doctors, or stuff to give them, and the hospitals were indescribably full of disease. Nearly everybody had typhus. In the hospital I have seen dead men lying about, and the living ones lying on top of them simply to keep themselves from the cold outside. I have known Russian officers go outside and shoot their brains out rather than live under those conditions On one occasion I saw a train coming into Novorossisk with refugees, and I saw 120 corpses picked out of that train—people who were starved or killed with typhus from the cold.

The Russians themselves were all doing their best to stick to their job, to stick to the Allies, and the troops were getting practically no pay, for the money they got was worth nothing. Normally there are ten roubles to the English pound; when I left Russia it was 136,000 to one pound; so you can imagine what the money was worth out there. The little pay the soldiers got was of no use whatever to them, so the men were simply working for their board rations and fighting for no pay whatever. The consequence was that they had been through so much, had suffered so much, that a lot of those people seemed to be absolutely dazed; they seemed to be in a dream, many of them, and it was jolly hard to get anything out of them. In going out there I had taken on the staff work, and I found I had to do a lot of it myself. You had to take a fellow by the neck and shake him till you got your work done. Comparing Russian conditions with those we had in France, of course the fighting in France was terrific, but we were looked after in other ways.

Well, those armies of Denekin's were retreating—one at Odessa, another along on the Crimea, and another lot at Novorossisk. Odessa fell first, I think, owing to the commander there being what we commonly call a "rotter"; he seemed to be of no use, and Odessa was taken by the Bolshevists. We got a lot of refugees off. It was very difficult, because we could not get our ships nor our ice-breakers, and so on The members of the Mission were not allowed to fight at all; there were very strong orders from the British Government that we were simply to assist and not to fight. However, at Odessa I think a few British Officers we had there, with some of the cadets, youngsters, Russians, managed to hold the corners of the streets, and they got the women and children out, most of them, assisted by the navy; but I am sorry to say there were many hundreds who had their throats cut by the Bolshevists when they got in.

The next army was retreating on the Crimea, but the Crimea never fell at all. That was held on by a magnificent fellow called General Slaschchoff, a most extraordinarily fine character. He only had about 2,000 or 3,000 men with him, and the neck of the Crimea is seven miles wide, but he kept off thirteen Bolshevist attacks, five of which were serious, two of which got bang into the Crimea, but he routed them and held on to the Crimea until the very last. He is a wonderfully fine fellow, a fine disciplinarian, and loved by all his men. (Applause) I may tell you he had the assistance of about thirty British Officers I sent over to give him a hand, and they, I am glad to say, did fight, though they are not supposed to. He was a very cheerful fellow, and a most amusing person. He always dressed in white, for some reason, and he used to walk anywhere in the front line amongst his men in this white coat. I remember going out on a moonlight night, and walking along with him, till we came in sight of a line, and I said, "What about this?" He replied, "Oh, this is all right." But we had not been through it when the Bolshevists let us have it; so the white coat is not a good thing to carry about. He was a good disciplinarian, and his troops were well dressed, but he said, "My soldiers have a nasty way some times of selling their coats. Of course they are badly paid, I know that; do the British soldiers sell their coats?" I said, "I have known it sometimes" He said, "These fellows always do it, and if you hang them it is a poor thing to hang good soldiers; they are good soldiers, really, I have not known much better. Of course they sell those things to the Jews, the bad Jews about here, so my order now is that if a soldier sells his coat I don't bother him about it, but I find the Jew who has bought it and hang him." (Laughter) Thus you get rid of a bad Jew and save a good soldier.

Talking about British troops, I don't know if any of you know that gas-bag story. In the old days along the line we were all supposed to carry a gas-bag. In the early days you saw a nasty wet thing like a rat-trap, and everybody was supposed to wear those, and there were very strict orders that every man in the front line had to have his gas bag on. One of the Generals—I won't mention his name was going down the line to inspect. When he got half way down he suddenly discovered he had not had a gas-bag on himself, so he met one of the men coming back, "Well, you don't want the gas-bag; give me yours." So he handed it to him, and the General went along down the trenches, and on looking around he finally saw a fellow without a gas-bag, so he went up to him and said, "Now, this is too bad; you know the strict orders, and everybody has a gas-bag except you." Of course the poor man was shivering like the devil; then the general said, "All right, I will give you my gas-bag," so he took the gas-bag off, asked the man if he knew how to put it on, and the soldier said he did, so the General said, "Let us see how you do it." The man opened the gas-bag, and pulled it on, and instead of being a gas-bag it was an old pair of socks. (Great laughter)

Well, at Novorossisk during January and February last year we managed to evacuate in various store-ships and in other ways, about 12,000 women and children, and thus saved them from having their throats cut by the Bolshevists. They were landed finally in Cyprus, and on one of the great islands. We also got about 6,000 wounded in Constantinople and thereabouts. It was very difficult to get those people off; they are very fond of Russia, and we had to go down on our knees to get them away; they would rather go by the last ship, they said, and it was very hard to get them on board. Some of these people got nasty treatment from the Green Guards, and I asked the Captain of the *Benbow* if he could not put a few shots down there, so he let off a few guns. That day we happened to be loading a ship which would take about 2,000 refugees, and they all had tickets to go on board, but we had only got about twenty on board by mid-day; the others wanted to stay till the last ship. By the afternoon, however, they began to pour down, so we came to the conclusion that this was because of the shooting that had been going on down on the quays. It was quite true, for when we wanted to load the next ship I asked the men if they wanted to go down again and let off a few shots, and those fellows went off in no time.

About the end of March the finale came, and those Bolshevists closed in around, with a tremendous break in Denekin's army The men deserted their officers, and there was a lot of ill feeling; each lot was letting each other know, and they came swarming down the coast. I had a certain lot of defences down there, made in the water, to try and get people off in decent order, but they would not obey their officers, and they came streaming down, and we had over 100,000 people there standing around the quay. As soon as they got near us they would take our word for anything. It was pathetic to see the blind faith those fellows had in a British officer; they would do any mortal thing for us. (Applause) We had a big party standing around the quays, but there was little or no hustling, though the Bolshevists were practically all around our landing, and were shooting, yet those fellows were standing back because they said, "We know if the British officers can get us on the ship they will do so; if not, it is our bad luck. "We got off about 60,000 of those fellows. Luckily we had got the women and children away before. We took them to the Crimea. Our officers were perfectly magnificent. We had several destroyers, a couple of cruisers, and a battleship and those fellows worked all day and night and simply filled up those battleships and smaller craft with those refugees and other people, and as I say, we saved about 60,000. (Applause) Many, I am sorry to say, were killed, and the others disappeared into South Russia. About a fortnight or so afterwards we put some officers ashore, and they somehow gathered more refugees and we managed to get off another 10,000 on the coast of the Black Sea.

Then we got to the Crimea. We put every one in the Crimea, which was still held. General Denekin was there for some days, and then he was taken off home; he and the Chief of his Staff went off to Constantinople, and in the Russian Embassy there his Chief of Staff was shot through the heart, I don't know whether it was by a Bolshevik or by whom.

After Denekin was Kornilof, his son, a boy of fourteen, and a girl of twenty. This girl worked in the hospitals right away through the war. From the age of fifteen she was managing a lot of hospitals herself in her own father's regiment, which they called the Kornilof regiment; she was fifteen when she started and twenty-one when she finished. When his Chief of Staff was shot in Constantinople this lad was so devoted to General Denekin that he sat outside the General's door with a revolver, and no one could persuade him to leave the door, until the little lad dropped dead. (Applause)

General Wrangel took command in the Crimea, and he was a very different type of man from the others. He is a man with great organizing power, and above all—what the Russian wants—a great disciplinarian. If he issued an order he saw it was obeyed. Our first task was to try and get the whole Crimea organized. It was nothing but chaos when we got there. There were reactionary parties who wanted the Czar back; there were Bolshevist parties, and German parties. The place was absolutely upside down. So we turned to Wrangel and his men, got the others put into disgrace, got the troops all reorganized, and we got on pretty well. We reduced the Mission to about 170 officers and 500 men, and everything began to work very well indeed. The only discouragement about it was that the whole situation was bound to became very bad before long. I wired to the government that Denekin would have to go forward and get supplies or he would have to be supplied from behind. He was not supplied from behind, so finally, about the beginning of June, he made an advance. It was a very fine piece of work indeed. He advanced from the north of the Crimea, and at the same time he took a force of 8,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalry, embarked them in twenty-four ships, and landed them right in the Sea of Azov, behind the Bolshevists. The whole thing was extremely well managed; I never saw a better piece of work than that was.

In that advance he got a lot of food and stuff and spare grain that he should have exported, but there was nothing to give those peasants for the grain. The grain had all been stuck on railways and sidings for export. It belonged to the peasants, but had been taken away by the Bolshevists, and they didn't get a bawbee for it. The advance did very well, and they got a lot of prisoners and guns.

Then I got a wire that the mission was to be with-drawn, and in the end of June we just cut our cables with the Russians and for no rhyme or reason at all left them standing there. Of course when we left there was no more help for them. I believe some one did go out there and take them over, but nothing came of it. However, the finale came in November, when the whole Bolshevist army massed about 30,000 to 40,000 against Wrangel's 4,000 or 5,000, and attacked them. They held out for several days, but finally were pushed back and the Bolshevists trooped into the Crimea. We had, however, arranged the organization for embarkation of the troops and everything else, and they were able to get a lot of refugees, a lot of children and women, and the great majority of the troops off safely. I believe 150,000, were taken to Constantinople, but nobody would help them; none of the Allies wanted them, so they stopped on board those ships without food and water for many days, and I believe a lot of them threw themselves overboard and drowned themselves. The British Tommies, however, had a pretty big force of troops in Constantinople, and they gave up half their rations to feed those people. (Applause) What has become of them all since I cannot tell; the last I heard of Wrangel was that he was going down to Russia; what has happened to his people I don't know. All those fellows who fought with him, and are now God knows where, are fellows who stuck to the Allies all the way through, and all these women and children are the families of those who fought for the Allied cause, and died for doing so. The Russians have probably more faults than other people, but who has not faults? We have got them ourselves; but from what I have told you you will think these Russians came out with a certain amount of honour.

The future of Russia is very hard to foretell. Of course Bolshevism is quite impossible. That sort of government cannot go on; it cannot be permanent; it is bound to break down some day. My own view is that they will go on for years with revolution after revolution; the country is so vast that revolutions will turn up everywhere. What they need is a guiding hand. They have lost so many intelligent people that they have not enough to go around. Many and many a time they said, "We want the British to take us over, and get done with it," but it could not be done. What I was frightened of was that those people, being so apt to be weary of revolution and wanting peace at any price, might choose the Germans to rule them, and if the Germans got that country it would be an awful thing; for the country is full of wealth, and if they got it they would pay for their own country and we should be as we were before the war. I don't feel, personally, that Bolshevism is absolutely scotched; I do not feel that we have really beaten the Germans. They started this infernal movement, and they fathered it, and I believe they are going to get the benefit out of it in the end if we don't look out.

I am also afraid that Russia is not the only country where there is Bolshevism I think it exists elsewhere under other names. I am perfectly certain that at home we have other things just as bad as Bolshevism. There are many things we know that are wrong with the Old British Empire, but I always believe that, given time and the right methods, matters will absolutely right themselves in the end. (Applause) Bolsheviks dislike right methods; they simply play with revolution for their own ends, and to gain power, and to line their pockets. Of that I am perfectly convinced by what I saw in Russia. I do not think it is by revolution that matters are to come right, and the Bolshevist knows that as well as I do—he does not want things to come right. But the Bolshevists have brains and very unscrupulous methods, and they persuade the working man that Bolshevism is going to be all right, that it is going to lead to a sort of paradise; but from what I have seen in Russia I think it is much more likely to lead him to hell.

I look upon Bolshevism as a sort of horrible disease that often gets lodgment in your mind without your knowing it. Those fellows speak so well that you can't but believe them sometimes, and there seems to be only one way out of that—treat it like typhus or cholera, or any other disease we inoculate against. (Applause) What I mean by inoculation in this case is education. We must not confine ourselves to knowing about each little tiny place in the country in which we happen to live. We have got a great Empire and good old British army, and we need to learn everything about them ourselves, to find out all their good points—never mind the bad ones, you will get plenty of people to show you those—but study, and learn, and then when a Bolshevist comes along you can meet him on his own ground, know what he is talking about, and be immune when he presents his horrible propaganda. This Bolshevism has sunk into Russia because the people there, the peasants, are ignorant; they know nothing about the outside world; they simply know their own surroundings and conditions, and if anybody comes along with a nice voice and pleasant manner, they believe everything he says. There is no more friendly soil for the Bolshevik propaganda than the man who doesn't know much more than his ordinary surroundings.

To me the late war was an education; I met a host of excellent friends, people from all over the British Empire, and more particularly from Canada, hence the reason why you see me here at this moment. (Applause) I have no doubt that most of you have been over on the other side and have also made heaps of good friends. (Applause) What I say to you is, keep up your friendship; it is worth everything; these good friendships weld our British Empire together; they are the making of the British Empire, which must keep together, whether there are Bolshevists or whether there are not. There are many reasons why the British Empire should keep together, but there are two outstanding ones, to my mind. One reason is the prestige of the British Empire; the whole world knows the motto, that we have always had, "Play the Game." (Loud applause) Now, there is no more magnificent example of playing the game than the late war furnished, and I don't think we ought ever to go back on that. The second reason is, our duty, the enormous duty we have that we and our children and our children's children owe to those magnificent fellows who went out to France and gave their lives for us and for the British Empire. (Applause) I don't think, Gentlemen, we can break faith with them. (Loud and continued applause)

A hearty vote of thanks to Sir Jocelyn Percy was moved by Col. George T. Denison, seconded by Major-General Williams and enthusiastically approved by the large audience.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE FIRST ASSEMBLY AT GENEVA

AN ADDRESS BY RT. HON. SIR GEORGE E. FOSTER, K.C.M.G., D.C.L., LL.D.

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, February 3, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL, in introducing the speaker said,—Gentlemen, I am happy to introduce, to-day, Sir George Foster who will speak on the "League of Nations and the First Assembly at Geneva". We offer him our felicitations on his recent adventure and I am sure you will join with me in giving him congratulations on his recent marriage.

SIR GEORGE FOSTER

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—What I want to say to-day I must put in as small compass as possible, and it will be in the shape of a simple conversation with you with reference to some things about which you possibly know a good deal more than I do. One requisite of the

---

Sir George is a Gold Medallist of the University of New Brunswick, was a student in Edinburgh and Heidelberg and later a professor of classics in his Alma Mater. He was elected a member of the House of Commons in 1882 and has held, at different times, the portfolios of Marine and Fisheries, Finance and Trade and Commerce. He supported Trade Preference between the Colonies and the Mother Country in 1892, and in 1903, in a series of brilliant speeches in England and Scotland, he championed Imperial Trade Preference. He was one of Canada's representatives at the Peace Conference, Paris, 1919, and one of the signatories of the Treaty of Versailles. He has recently been called to the Senate.

successful teacher is that he should assume that the class before him knows nothing of his subject, and consequently nothing is to be let escape by him, of information that he wishes to impart to them. May I take that liberty with this audience to-day, with this admonitory remark, that if there are any precocious students in this assembly who know more than their teacher, just repress your anxiety to set your teacher right while he is doing his preliminary stunt. (Laughter)

I think probably that with some phases of the League of Nations you are all more or less well informed, and I propose to-day to confine myself to the latest development mainly, (that is) to the First Assembly of The League, which is the newest of the agencies which go to round out the functioning powers of The League of Nations

I may say by way of introduction, however, with reference to the League itself, that I think we may all agree that it is a new and very important experiment in the history of world nations dealing with each other. It has been conceived, it has been launched, and to-day its functioning agencies are complete, and it is on trial before the world as an experiment which has behind it the hopes and the prayers of the very vast majority of the world's humanity, no matter in what part they reside. Added to that I want to make this remark—that I think the League will work out its functions successfully, not because it works through crowned heads or the heads of democratic countries; not because it may enlist the sympathy of great men in politics, great men in military achievements, great men in naval warfare, great men so-called in any respect; but that, if the League successfully functions and brings out results something near to the wishes of the peoples of the world, it will be because the great mass of the common people—men like ourselves in this community and others—have a knowledgeable sense of what its ideals and purposes are, and are behind it to the full extent of their sympathy and their influence. Therefore it is with great pleasure that I embrace every possible opportunity of speaking to men like yourselves;

not that I may impart much new information but that I may stir up your minds by way of remembrance that this is a matter, the success of which depends upon you; and to ask you in all your capacities of life, insofar as your knowledge and your influence go, first to make yourselves well informed about this business, and secondly to press the battle clean on to the gates. We can win in this work if we set our minds and our hearts upon it. We cannot win if we are apathetic or neglectful of the great opportunity that has come to us.

The League of Nations was really launched with the adoption of the covenant or draft at the Peace Conference. After six thousand years of toilsome progress —progress certainly, undoubtedly—after six thousand years of the trial of other methods, the power and might of armed force, the alliance of one country with another for selfish or partly selfish purposes, the dominations of great conquerors—of which Napoleon in these later times has been a noted example—all these methods have been tried with the result that at the end of them all the culmination was found in the unparalleled war of the five years from 1914, and the unparalleled and almost unparallelleable disaster which has resulted from that war. The war is over, men; the armistice has been signed; the peace treaties are being signed one by one; but the effects of the war remain with us, deep in our hearts, deep in our homes, deep in every activity—economic, business, or other, as you please—and the trail of the serpent of war will remain with us for many, many years. In the face of this object lesson is it not time that the world tried something else? (Hear, hear) And is not this something that the world may well try? For if disaster and the trail of consequences which you know so well, and which so many have personally experienced, have followed this war which has just ended, what may be said of the trail that would follow another great world war? We cannot conceive it; we cannot face it; we do not want it; we will not have it. (Loud applause)

I think I cannot do better than to read to you the preamble of the covenant which was signed at first by thirty-two nations of the world. The preamble shows what that was. The high contracting parties, that is the thirty-two nations at the Peace Conference and the thirteen that have been added since and the six that were added at the Assembly in virtue of the power of the Assembly to admit new members—forty-seven in all—have set their hand and seal to these principles:—

> "In order to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the prescription of open, just and honorable relations between nations; by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as an actual rule of conduct among Governments; and by the maintenance of justice and of scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealing of organized peoples with one another; we, the High Contracting Powers, agree to this covenant of the League of Nations."

That, to my mind, marks an advance unparalleled and unexampled in the history of the world. Forty-seven nations are now behind this. Some more would be behind it had they been eligible for admission at the time to the League of Nations. Some others have not ratified the Peace Treaty and begun to function as a part of the League of Nations, but the door is open; and to my mind they will come in through that door, although maybe it will need to be enlarged or altered a little to suit the circumstances. Yet, my feeling is strong and my confidence is sure that in one way or other the remaining nations of the world will join with us and become members of the great world peace organization. (Applause)

This covenant of the League of Nations which every man should have a copy of, (and of which a copy can be obtained by corresponding with the League of Nations Union, 15 Grosvenor Crescent, London, together with other pertinent matter with reference to the League of Nations, its ideals and its operations) contains twenty-six articles dealing with a wonderful range of function—first, as regards membership of the League; second as regards the functioning agencies through which it carries out the obligations of the covenant and of the treaties, and the duties imposed thereby; and thirdly as to the reduction of armaments, one of the prime things to be considered and to be attained in reducing the world from a war status to a peace status. It deals with the guarantees against aggressions of one member against other members; with the different methods of settling international disputes by agreements, helped along by the force of the League, by arbitrations, or by a court of International Justice, or by the Assembly or the Council itself; with the sanctions of the League, the methods of imposing not only penalties which will suffice to prevent aggressions but by carrying out efficiently through moral or economic influence the agreements made and the purposes and ideals of the League. It deals with mandatories—that new system of administering what you might call the derelict colonial possessions of conquered empires which have been disassociated from their former territories—mandatories which some nation takes in trust to administer, subject to the terms laid down by the League through its Council, and subject to report of the mandatories to Council, and the consideration of those reports by the Assembly (of which I shall speak a little later) on the basic principles that it is a trust in every respect, and that it is not to be administered for the selfish interest of the mandatory but in the interest of the people that come under the administration itself. Then as to the great social activities which have to do with health, with dangerous drugs and opium, with the traffic in women and children, and with the protection of natives from firewater and firearms and other forms of disintegration and destruction—which to-day are being carried on in nations by national influence, but which are shorn of their ultimate object unless you can get the cooperation of all or most of the nations of the world.

Take, for instance, the opium trade. China may do her part, Britain may do her part, India may do her part, but little can be accomplished in a world-wide sense unless you have the other nations cooperating and working along the same lines of prevention and of cure. These the League fosters, commends to the nations and seeks to co-ordinate for their greater success.

Then there is the registration and publication of future treaties. Treaties shall no longer remain hidden in the breasts of diplomats and in the pigeon-holes of administrations, a source of suspicion and an incentive to counter national combinations, but shall be registered at a certain place, shall be public and open to the world. Secret diplomacy will be shorn of its strength. Then there is the revision and modification of treaties already existing or treaties that may be made, if it proves that they become inapplicable to changing circumstances or if it is proved that they serve as a menace to good relations and an incentive to war.

Now, mind you,—and this always has to be kept in mind—it is not the purpose of the League to come into Canada and do Canada's administrative work in any of those particulars, but it is the purpose of the League to supervise, to get accord between all the nations if possible, or as many as possible; and so, on an international basis, by kindly effort and influence, and by wise negotiations, to assist these nations which are trying to carry on singly, to secure world-wide assent and world-wide impetus towards the reforms being carried out.

You see, then, what is covered by the League. It has a wonderful programme, it is a wonderful advance on anything that has preceded it. It heralds an era of peace and good-will, and lights up faintly at first, but with a surety, of growing brightness and power the habitations of the world. This light will grow wider, spread beyond the horizon, cover the sky at last with its soft splendour of peace and good-will amongst the peoples of the world. (Loud applause)

Now, one might say, what interest has Canada in this? Why should she attend meetings of the League of Nations, Assemblies, Councils, or the like of that? Why? Because Canada has a wonderfully precious investment in the future peace of the world. Why did she go to war? And with what blood and treasure did she meet the emergencies of that war? Was it simply to exercise a few battalions or gain a little temporary fame for courage and heroism—which indeed she gained, and rightly gained? Was that all? No; she put her sixty thousand dead, she put her more than a half-million men in khaki, she put her two billions and more of debt, she put these burdens and these sacrifices into an investment for the future peace of the world. (Loud applause) And if we have not been infinitely foolish in spending that blood and treasure, we are infinitely wise in seeing that that investment in trust is made the most of and brings back to us through all the years of the future the beauty and solace of peace, the surcease of war burdens, and the joy of heart and home that world security alone can give. I think Canada has a vested interest which she is bound to see is followed to the end.

Now, as to the organized League. There is a covenant which, as I say, has been signed by forty-seven nations and is being worked out by them. That covenant has its obligations, and those are made a constituent part of every treaty from the Treaty of Versailles on. How, then, are these obligations so imposed in the covenant and the treaties to be carried out? Simply and plainly stated—and insufficiently, because I cannot go into it deeply—her organs of functioning are mainly two.

There is, first, the Council which is appointed by the great powers—one representative on the Council for each one of the great powers. At that time there were five great powers interested. The United States has since declined to ratify the treaty and, though a great power, is not a member of the League and does not appoint her representative on the Council. But the other four great powers have each a representative on the Council, and the Assembly elects four members to represent all the other nations not represented by the five great powers. Those four added to the preceding four make up the eight members of the Council which functions from day to day, from week to week, during the whole year. That is the Council.

Then there is the Assembly which meets once every year, and which has just held its first meeting at Geneva. That Assembly is constituted by delegations from each member of the League of Nations, consequently forty-seven nations—forty-one nations at the beginning of the Assembly, because six were taken in on the latter days of its session—those forty-one nations had each the privilege of sending three delegates to the Assembly. Each nation, however, and mark that, has only one vote; so that Canada in voting and speaking power, had equal privilege and rights in the League of Nations as had France or any other of the nations that belong to the League. Each member state has three representatives but only one vote; and that is a wise thing, because thus you get wide counsel and equality of status among all the represented nations. Then those delegations may have their secretaries and their experts; so, in the first League of Nations, broadly speaking, there were three delegates allowable for each of the forty-one nations, and an expert and a secretary which made up for each delegation the five members who had their seats on the floor of the Assembly Hall.

An initial difficulty which loomed up large and affected the pride of nationality was as to who should have the first seats in the synagogue. (Laughter) Should it be France or should it be Liberia? That was the question, and one was evidently as proud as the other of the seat it should occupy. Some happy individual conceived the idea that, to get over this difficulty, it would be well to arrange the seating in alphabetical order. That was adopted, and I never heard a grumble thereafter with reference to it; and so, South Africa came at the first table with its five, and then the A's followed along—Argentina, Australia, and so on. Then coming up the next row there were the B's until they came to Britain and then to Canada, and so all down; and the great powers and the little powers on a footing of perfect equality occupied their desks and their seats, and there was no ruffling of anyone's pride.

Next came up the language difficulty. On the 15th November we met there, about 110 delegates, we will say, from forty-one different nations, of all colors, of all races, of all creeds, of all languages. How in the world were they to communicate with one another so long as Volapuk had not conquered the world, and Esperanto was still in its infancy? One might well think that it would be a second Tower of Babel in its confusion of tongues. It was started on the supposition that French and English should be the official languages. Immediately there developed a feeling amongst some others of the Latin race. I think there were about seventeen Latin nations, or their off-shoots, which spoke the Spanish language and so the question came up as to why Spanish should not also be an official language. The seventeen representatives of nations speaking Spanish made their plea and made it very strongly. It was discussed, and after discussion, in which both sides had maintained what were the difficulties and what would be the advantages, a perfect unanimity was attained. Why? Because common sense added to the vital, dominant spirit of that Assembly—that they were there for the purpose of realizing the ideals of the League and not sticking upon points of language or other unessentials—brought them all together at the last and the thing was solved in the following way: If a Spaniard wants to speak in Spanish, let him make his speech; but he must provide that it be translated in either English or French, and the translation given to his remarks then goes before the Assembly and is in the record just the same as it would be had he spoken in English or French. But as a matter of fact, of practical difficulty we experienced none. Every delegate in that Assembly from all those different nations was able to express himself either in French or English, so that what seemed to be a wonderful difficulty thus solved itself in that natural way, and we had no further trouble with it. Where a delegate spoke in English, it was immediately translated into French; or, if he spoke in French, it was immediately translated into English, and the delegates had the ideas of the speaker. There was no difficulty found in reference to that.

But when we came into that Assembly on that bright and beautiful morning, the 15th November, at the great historic city of Geneva, we were really there as delegations from forty-one nations, totally unacquainted with each other except as perhaps somebody might know somebody else upon some of the delegations; but, practically, we were all sitting down there totally strange to each other. Now came the test of what many people said would be a difficulty which would be inescapable. How are those men to get together, make their ideas known and get down into a working capacity? It would be bad enough in a Tory convention or in a Liberal pow-wow (laughter) where people do know each other and in which all are impressed with their party ideals; but bringing in strangers of all races, creeds, religions, and languages, from all parts of the world, and setting them down in an Assembly Hall, it would appear as though they never would get acquainted with each other and never would get on a serviceable and operating basis.

Well, as in many other things, the trial in the right spirit worked out satisfactorily, and I never saw a set of people of one nationality, or of more, coming together in a conventional or quasi-parliamentary way, who got to work so quickly, so amicably, so smoothly, as did that First Assembly of the World League of Nations.

I think I am right in saying that, taking the social functions into account, the committee intimacies into account, and the general spirit that pervaded all, inside of a week we had sized up each other, become well acquainted, and were prepared to go ahead on the basis of friendly and practical understanding. Now, there is where the benefit comes in trying a thing. The doubter says, "No, it is absolutely impossible; you will be a veritable Tower of Babel and you will never get on. Well, we did get together and we did get on.

The first thing necessary was to elect a President, and that was done on the first day. I suppose it was the spirit of unity and amity, helped a little by the foresight of some of the delegates who may have had some communication one with another, but it all worked out smoothly. The man who presided provisionally was Mr. Hymans, the representative on the Council for Belgium, who called the meeting to order. An address of welcome was given by the President of the Swiss Federation.

Then we came to the point of electing the permanent President, and that was to be done by secret ballot. The leader of each delegation was to proceed from his seat up to the dais and put the vote into the box and then pass down again in regular order. Mr. Motta of Switzerland who, by courtesy, might have had claims to be President of the Assembly meeting in his own country, proposed Mr. Hymans of Belgium as permanent President. His name was put to the vote, and he was elected by a great majority, though some sympathetic votes were given, as is common in more or less distinguished assemblies in our own and in other countries.

Then, how were these people to proceed in carrying out the business? There were no rules of procedure. It was solved very sensibly and excellently well. The Secretariat had prepared a provisional set of rules of procedure, and after a little discussion these were accepted by the Assembly, subject to certain amendments. A committee was appointed to formulate permanent rules, and we went on under the provisional ones. In due time there came along the amended rules which were reported to the Assembly, fairly discussed, and adopted and these guided us to the end of our work. You see, after all, though many had anticipated a very Babel, how easily and naturally through sensible conduct and reasonable patience, a solution was obtained. After all, we were not there ten days, perhaps not five days, until those delegates, one and the other, took no account of a man's creed or a man's colour or a man's nationality or a man's language, but every man went for his simple human worth, and we took a suggestion just as kindly and as well from the dark as from the white races. It was a fine democratic equality, all states equal, and all equal, not in the form of prescription or letter or word, but all equal in the realization of the great idea that we were members of the human race and that that one element is indeed the important thing. (Loud applause)

Now, as to the business. How was that conducted? First of all, we elected a President and then twelve Vice-Presidents, and the President and the twelve Vice-

Presidents took general supervision of the business of the Assembly. They met frequently, prepared and supervised the order of proceedings, and held a sort of a guiding hand over the work of the Assembly as a whole. That worked very well. It is not immodest for me to remark here—that Canada received one of the Vice-Presidencies of the Assembly. (Applause) Six great commissions or committees were set up, each with its own line of subjects; and every proposal and resolution which came up in the Assembly itself, or however it originated, was sent to the commission which had that subject in charge. On each side of these commissions there was one delegate for each nationality, forty-one members in all. There again we came together and sat around the long tables, with every nationality represented, and the same form of procedure was followed as in the Assembly. We got within arm's length there, and the process of mutual understanding and getting at each other's point of view, was more quickly and more effectively worked out. On all those six commissions the delegates of Canada had places, one on each; and once for all I may say that they took up their share of the work, applied their best energy and ability to the work, and I think they did, well, pretty nearly as good work as the delegation of any other nation that was represented Having said that, and having due appreciation for the youth and modesty of my friend, Mr. Rowell, I will not go any further in praise of the Canadian delegation. (Laughter and applause) These commissions were really educational institutions. It was wonderful how soon we came to know each other's trend of thought, though coming from a background of centuries of tradition and education, each different from the other, which makes the viewpoint of one man necessarily different from the viewpoint of another brought up among different traditions and different ways of thinking. But there again, Gentlemen,—and it is the hope of the League of Nations—there never was a time when the impelling idea, the guiding spirit, that we were there to work out the ideals of the League of Nations, was not uppermost and did not in the end dominate and bring us to accordant conclusions.

There is one thing about the Assembly, as about the Council meetings,—that while having different functions to perform, set out in the covenant, and in the Treaty, and obligatory upon them, and whilst having some functions which they performed jointly, there must, with reference to most of them, be complete unanimity or the thing cannot be concluded. We did arrive, on all the great questions which were debated, at a unanimous conclusion in the end, and it was not a conclusion by mere compromise which weakened the essential qualities and made the result pointless and ineffective but it was a compromise of good feeling on a sensible plan which worked out, if not perfectly in the minds of all, yet effectually, each of the great issues which were discussed and upon which conclusions were reached That is to be kept in mind by us. If forty-one nations could do that through their representatives, what is to prevent the whole world of nations doing it? (Applause) And if that almost insuperable objection, variety of tongues and nationalities and the necessity of getting unanimity on those questions, in practice actually worked no hindrance when forty-one nations were debating and deciding them, is there not fair warrant for assuming that if we had the few others that still remain outside in the League the same thing would take place? (Hear, hear) The objector's view vanishes when you come to humanity getting together on a common plane where ideas rise above the tribal and the local and the selfish and merge into a great sentiment of peace for all nations and how best to secure it and to avoid the curse and scourge of war. (Applause)

Just here the point occurs as to how many nations are yet outside the League? Germany, Hungary and Turkey are still out; Austria and Bulgaria and four other small countries were taken in at Geneva. Outside of the League of Nations to-day, excepting enemy nations that have not yet been admitted but to whom the door is open, and who will be welcomed once they give the necessary guarantees of sincerity to enable them to become co-workers with the other members of the League—how many? Soviet Russia is out, awaiting the period of settled government; Mexico is out, and all would like to have Mexico in. With one or two exceptions, all of South America is in the League. The United States is not yet a member of the League and that is universally regretted. Well, just put the nations together and count up the population and you will find that seventy-five per cent. of the populations of the world are within the League to-day, (loud applause) and to suppose that the League will stop functioning because two or three of the nations of the world have not yet adhered thereto is, to my mind, untenable and unreasonable. The impetus behind, the driving power, all that desire which rises like a prayer from every hamlet and territory in the wide world, all those high ideals which draw men and nations toward higher and better spheres of action, the cultivation of openness and frankness in international dealings, and the settlement of disputes by arbitration and legal tribunals—that impetus, that high ideal is sufficient to carry humanity through to the ultimate realization of all that is purposed in the great League experiment now being tried out in the world. (Applause)

Time fails, and I fail with time (laughter and voices,—"No") although I am making the best struggle I can against the old chap and I have stuck it out so far. (Great laughter and applause) Time fails me to go into particulars as to what has been accomplished. Two or three very brief, sketchy allusions must suffice.

What has the Council of the League of Nations done? That I will not touch in detail though it has done vitally important work in the few months of its existence. What has the First Assembly done to justify its calling together? Well, amongst other things, it has organized itself and that was a wonderfully big thing to do, and it has thus completed the working organism of the League of Nations. Up to the meeting of the Assembly, the League possessed only a Council of Eight, far removed from the locality and ready cognizance of the nations that formed the League, sitting occasionally in Paris, in London, in Brussels, in Italy, and trying to carry on. That Council has been in actual operation only about six months. But how vivifying, how vitalizing a working force is provided by the forty-seven nations of the world in the person of their representatives coming fresh from the field, who establish an Assembly, discuss everything that has been done by the Council, lay out future plans, and authorize the functioning of other bodies, and so vitalize and strengthen the whole working machinery—a limited and restricted machinery until it was thus completed. Think then that the Assembly has met, has organized itself, and thus rounded out the mechanism of the League which is in itself a great achievement. (Applause)

But it did more than that. It caught the eye of the world. Newspaper men from every quarter were there. Everything that was said and done was flashed out to every quarter of the world. There was provided a forum at which the representatives of three-fourths of the world's population met to discuss, in the sight of all men, those great questions which are necessarily to be solved if the world shall have rest from war. It is a great thing to have a world platform, where every year the representatives of the nations of the world may voice their sentiments, may formulate their conclusions, and embody those conclusions into forms of executive work. (Hear, hear)

But the Assembly has done more than that, to my mind. If nothing more were done than that these representative men of forty-seven nations should meet, exchange views on vital matters, find themselves in unison, cement lasting friendships, and work for common ideals through six weeks with practical results; that in itself is worth the calling together of an Assembly of the League of Nations. It solves the doubt of the sceptic; it freshens the hope and strengthens the optimism of the members of the League in the final success of its high purposes; and it is a proof that, if we set ourselves to pursue unfalteringly the objects in view, we may rest assured that succeeding Assemblies will show even better results when the League of Nations is fully linked up and all its functions are capable of being performed.

One other thing has been accomplished which I must not forget to mention and that is, probably, the most important achievement of the Assembly session; the establishment of a Court of International Justice. Let us see what has been done in that respect. The Council called together ten of the famous jurists of the world, of whom Mr. Elihu Root of the United States was one of the most distinguished. They met, and devoted six weeks to examination and conference. They came to a unanimous conclusion on a proposal for a Court of International Justice. They sent that to the Council of the League. The Council of the League took it into consideration, made some changes and passed it on to the Assembly. The Assembly sent it to one of its large commissions, where it was referred to a special committee of ten—five of whom were members of the original body of jurists of which I have just made mention, and five others from the Assembly itself. Of that sub-committee, the Canadian Minister of Justice was a member, and I know from personal observation and knowledge that he was one of the most influential members upon that sub-committee. (Applause) This committee came to a unanimous conclusion which was reported to the Assembly, and the Assembly adopted it with unanimity. (Applause) There you have a most notable advance upon anything before attempted. You have not merely arbitration as agreed upon by two States before an *ad hoc* judge, not a mere arbitration such as is carried on by the Hague Arbitration Court; where the parties choose their own judges, but you have a permanent body of jurists.

The great difficulty in the matter heretofore was as to who should nominate the judges. The great powers said, "Let us nominate them". The smaller powers said, "We have interests at stake and cannot consent to that course, and so it was impossible to get the proper basis on which to select the court of arbitration. It was overcome in this way—ingeniously, I think, and practically well. The International Hague Arbitration Court has groups of nations adhering thereto and those groups of nations are called upon to nominate, each one, four of its best judges fulfilling certain conditions. They must not have political or diplomatic relations with their Governments, they must be free from political influence, and such judges are nominated for every group of nations. Any nations not in the groups, under the Hague Arbitration Court are allowed to associate themselves in groups and nominate four each. So you have nominated by the nations four of their distinguished jurists under limiting conditions that take them out of the political atmosphere; and from that roster the Council and Assembly conjointly select a court of eleven judges and four deputy judges. This plan goes for ratification to the different members of the League. Already twenty-three members of the League have signified their adhesion to the plan and it comes into force when the majority of the nations have ratified it. There is every possibility, there is almost a certainty, that when the Assembly meets next September in Geneva that the way will be opened for the selection of the judges and the Court will be constituted. There you have a tribunal set up before whom the disputes of nations may go—a legal tribunal above political influence, absolutely independent, there to sit for that purpose and for nothing else. The moral force of this achievement will be so great that I don't think there is any civilized nation in the world that will forego the privileges attached to such a tribunal for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes. Now that is a gain which is inestimable in its value, not only in itself but as a forerunner of what may come.

In conclusion, if we don't have this League of Nations as I have imperfectly described it, to what shall we revert? Back again to private alliances amongst ambitious nations? Secret treaties between them? All the old effects of alliances for domination for selfish purposes of one kind or another? Back into that maelstrom from which we have issued through the great war?

That, or the League of Nations functioning in this way, are the only alternatives.

Again I appeal to a world which has bled and suffered, and is suffering to-day, which has sowed the seed of blood and treasure, expenditure which is incalculable, to work out its future on the high planes that I have described; that or back again to the maelstrom of possible and of probable war. Is there any alternative? Is there any chance for a man not making his decision between the two? Surely, surely, not to-day when these recollections are fresh upon us; when the heartstrings still strain and the hearts still bleed; when the trail of consequences almost blots out from our view the promise of economic, business and financial activity and progress in the world. Knowing all these things as we see them now, by the light of a tremendous war and of the fell disaster which has followed as a consequence, is there any point anywhere on which a man can hinge himself upon giving or not giving his entire adhesion and the full force of his power and influence towards the working out of this great experiment?

We are called upon in this our age to a responsibility which our forefathers never had. When has the world had an opportunity of choice between two such great alternatives as this? In the name of the trust—the trust in which we have invested so much sacrifice of blood and treasure—it is for us who are the recipients and the holders of that trust to work up to it, to put hearts and minds into it, and maintain for future centuries the great step in advance which has arisen out of the woes and experiences, bitter and deep, of the six thousand years which have preceded us. (Loud applause, the audience rising and cheering)

THE HON. SIR WILLIAM MULOCK,

CHIEF JUSTICE

Sir William in moving a vote of thanks to Sir George Foster for his inspiring, instructive and eloquent address, said that this was the best speech he had ever heard Sir George deliver. The day had passed when nations could live isolated from each other. Whatever excuses there may have been for the old methods of dealing with international disputes, they did not apply in these days of steam and electricity, and nations had no right to keep aloof from each other in a world where so many interests were held in common. The issue before the nations to-day is to establish justice in the earth, and the address which has just been delivered will be a most helpful contribution towards the desired end.

FRATERNAL GREETINGS FROM UNCLE SAM

ADDRESSES BY ARTHUR LORD, PRESIDENT PILGRIMS' ASSOCIATION, HENRY TAFT AND WILLIAM B. KELLEN

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, February 10, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: Gentlemen,—To-day this Empire Club of Canada is meeting at a unique time. This morning General Smuts and his party in South Africa have won the day (loud applause) so we have this morning sent a cable to Gen. Smuts with hearty congratulations from the Empire Club of Canada. I am sure you will approve of the action. (Hear, hear) Now, Gentlemen, I will let you into a secret. The speaker who was to come here to-day to tell us the story about Hudson Bay has not yet arrived. Personally I feel mortified, and so does the Committee. But there is another part of the secret which I will disclose in a moment. Capt. State was to have told the story of Hudson Bay. We came here to hear that story; but we are going to hear a story that, while different, is quite similar, because the story of Hudson Bay in a large measure is the story of Canada and the early Pilgrims who came here 300 years ago, and that story is closely interwoven with Canadian history. By a fortunate circumstance we have visiting our city to-day several gentlemen of the American Bar Association who are attending the annual meeting of our own Bar Association, among them being the President of the Pilgrim Society, and he is going to tell us about the Pilgrims who came to Canada and the United States three hundred years ago. (Applause) I say this is a very fortuitous circumstance, because it is only within the last twenty minutes that we have plucked up courage to ask these gentlemen to speak—these gentlemen who are our guests. I have much pleasure, then, in calling upon Mr. Arthur Lord, of Boston, Massachusetts, the President of the Pilgrim Society, and late President of the Massachusetts Bar Association.

MR. ARTHUR LORD

Gentlemen of the Empire Club,—I sympathize with you in your misfortune, and you can sympathize with me in my embarrassment in having to deal with such a subject after such a brief introduction. I wish the speaker of the afternoon, Capt. State, could have told his story. I suppose he is a regular, but sometimes, when the regulars don't come up in season, we have to call on volunteers (laughter) and I am drafted this afternoon as a volunteer. You were to hear about the Hudson's Bay Company. Now, how widely different the two subjects. How can I speak on Hudson Bay? We lawyers are a good deal more familiar with hot water than with cold water (laughter) and so I am going to adopt the suggestion of my friend, your presiding officer, and make some remarks about the celebration in which we are very much interested in New England and in the United States, and in which I hope to interest you for a moment, in the hope that we may have the pleasure of seeing many of you there during the coming summer. (Hear, hear)

I noticed, as I entered Canada the other day, on one of the great buildings near the Welland Canal in the town of Welland, the words "The Plymouth Cordage Co." It is a familiar sound, for I passed by it in Plymouth, Mass., the other day on my way to Boston. I am very glad to know that, at least in business matters, we are friends and neighbours. (Applause)

Now, this world is divided, as I regard it, into three classes of men. In the first class there are those whose heads are always in the air, and their feet rarely on the ground; the second class are those whose feet are always on the ground and their heads never in the air among the realms of vision; and the third and the better and greater class, which the business men of both peoples represent, are the men whose heads are in the clouds and whose feet are on the ground, and who do not attempt to do impossibilities or to overcome insuperable obstacles, but recognize with practical common sense what is positive and possible and helpful, and then unite and find some way of doing it. (Applause) In that effort to meet the great responsibilities of the present and the future, the cause of freedom, of civilization and humanity, we want the people on both sides of that imaginary line which divides us to unite cordially without the slightest suspicion of misunderstanding or distrust. (Applause)

This is a company of business men, and I am going to begin by saying something about money that is invested in an enterprise, so you will know it is not entirely a dream of mine. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has appropriated $300,000 approximately, towards the commemoration of the landing of the Pilgrims, and the Federal Government has appropriated $300,000 to help it on. I said last night, and I am glad to repeat it here, that the Chairman of the Federal Commission is the gentleman who will be the next President of the United States. (Applause) Then from individuals, patriotic societies, and in other ways, an equal sum has been secured; so that within the course of a year or two, in this effort of commemoration of a great event in the history of the English-speaking world, nearly a million dollars is expended, and it mainly goes into simple and dignified and permanent memorials. (Hear, hear) We began the celebration on the 21st of December, the day which marked for us the 300th anniversary of the Landing of the Pilgrims—a company of 102 Englishmen and English women and children sailing under the English flag, the common language and literature and history and traditions of which we have to-day—and found themselves on a lonely and deserted spot on the coast of New England at the beginning of a winter. When the spring arrived and the Mayflower returned, it left behind it every passenger, the living and the dead—and nearly half had died.

Now, if I were to designate what I may term the "Pilgrim quality" I should refer to that incident in its history as an illustration that they were not men whom small things or large things dismayed and defeated, but men who having entered upon the enterprise were there to remain to the end. (Applause) They were Englishmen; they loved, and recalled with pleasure, the green fields where their children played, the church yards where their sires were laid; but they had entered upon a new adventure in the history of the world. They brought to us several great ideas They brought the idea of religious toleration. That greatest gift of four centuries was the gift of the Pilgrims. They brought here that great English idea of home and family as the unit of the state for which not only palisades and forts were erected, but laws and ordinances established. They brought here the idea of civil liberty, and the ideas of justice and the sanctity of treaties. (Applause)

There are two illustrations in our history—for I am speaking as an Englishman to Englishmen—which are interesting and significant. The first was the treaty of the Pilgrims with an Indian tribe, evidencing the Golden Rule, and it was never broken while any of those who took part in the meeting of that day survived. The first American-born governor—Governor Josiah Winslow—could say of his colony that there was not a foot of land in the possession of any settler which was not acquired by true and honorable purchase from the aboriginal owners of the soil. (Applause) Now there is a land stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, marked by river and lake and prairie and mountain, and because there is a treaty stipulation made by members of the Anglo-Saxon race, the slumbers of the night are never disturbed nor the labours of the day interrupted by the fear of invasion. (Applause)

I want to add a single word as to the form of this celebration. We began in last December. It had already begun, perhaps, here in Canada; but it had begun in

Holland, the Pilgrims' Home for twelve years, with appropriate exercises in the great university city and the great business city of Holland. It had begun in Plymouth and Southampton, in England, with appropriate ceremonies marking the spot from which the Mayflower sailed on its voyage to the new and waiting world. Now we take it up in Massachusetts. We take it up for this country, and for every country that cares to join with us in recognizing their service, the service of the Anglo-Saxon race, whose contributions to the science of government are unequalled. (Applause)

I took the liberty of dealing last night with an incident which, with your permission, I will repeat, which impressed me mightily at the time. I suppose you know, for the practice here is the same, that we commemorate great occasions with oration and with poem; and we had at that time at Plymouth the distinguished senator from Massachusetts, Senator Lodge; the Governor of the Commonwealth; the next Vice-President of the United States, Governor Coolidge; a distinguished poet from the neighbouring university. The address and poem, as might have been expected, from the orator and poet, were both fine and wonderful. But there was a little incident that day which impressed me more than all the others, and that was when the distinguished senator from Massachusetts had finished a quotation from the address of Daniel Webster, made a hundred years ago, in which he emphasized and pointed out the method of the celebration of 1920 and used these interesting and stately words: "On the morning of that day, the 21st of December, 1920, although it may not disturb us in our repose, the voice of acclamation and gratitude commencing upon the rock of Plymouth will be transmitted through the millions of the sons of the Pilgrims till it loses itself in the murmurs of Pacific Seas." Then, pausing for a moment, the Governor stepped forward, lifted the telephone from the stand, and conveyed the greetings of that great audience to the Executive Chamber in San Francisco. (Applause) The vision of

Webster was realized in a way that even he could not have anticipated.

Now, we want to bring together these great English-speaking nations, provinces, dominions; and what better opportunity than to commemorate a great event in English history, of which England and Englishmen furnished the ship and the adventurers? (Loud applause)

President Mitchell: I am sure you will agree with me that it was a very fortunate accident that gave us the opportunity to hear Mr. Lord to-day. (Applause) I will now call on Mr. Henry Taft, a member of the New York Bar.

MR. HENRY TAFT

Mr. President,—I am glad you did not extend your introductory remarks, because you would probably have gotten into that kind of vicarious flattering introduction involving a member of my family to which I have become more or less accustomed. (Laughter) So far as I personally am concerned, perhaps it would be more appropriate—at least in volume—if I were introduced, as a fellow-member of the Labour Party, in England, recently introduced Will Crooks, the leader of that party. He said, "I have only got two things to say about Bill Crooks; first, he has never been in jail (laughter); second, God knows why he is not." (Renewed laughter) Now, by the way, my time has not expired, but, if your chairman had not limited me to three and a half minutes and given my predecessor fifteen minutes, I would like to tell you about my ancestry; because they all came over, on both sides, 260 years ago, and settled in that precious Commonwealth of Massachusetts. My generation is the first to have gotten the leaven of Ohio (laughter); but my mother was born in Boston, and I feel safe. I can look from the outside at all of those achievements of my Puritan ancestors with something of detachment—which is not always easy for one who has remained always in that great Commonwealth. (Laughter)

When I came in here I asked a gentleman on the other side of me why this Club was called the Empire Club. I have not got an answer yet, except such an answer as the Dutchman gave when somebody asked him why he called his dog "Hans". "Well," he said, "because Hans is his name." (Great laughter) Now, I am going to get at you. On my first visit to Toronto—and it is about the only visit I ever made to Toronto—forty-eight years ago, I spent a summer over here, and I don't suppose many of you gentlemen, from your appearance, remember the conditions that prevailed in the metropolis of this Province in those days, because they used to close the shops and offices and banks for three hours in the middle of the day upon special occasions. You don't remember that, but that was the kind of a happy beatific life which was lived by the residents of Ontario in that day. (Laughter) Now, I have been a good deal of a Canadian myself; I have spent fifteen of the happiest summers of my life on the northern shores of the lower St. Lawrence, where I have a cottage in the shadows of the Laurentian Hills. I know the two storied races that inhabit this country. I have been under the spell of the romance of your rivers and your mountains and your lakes. I know "Johnny Corteau." I know all his people, and I know what your aspirations are. I know your national feeling, and I have had the warmest kind of feeling for Canada, and I always feel as if I was among friends when I come here. (Loud applause) But I know some of your weaknesses, too. You are a little sensitive. (Laughter) There is an active discussion going on in the New York papers now, and one correspondent summed the origin of the letters of the exported Canadians who live in New York City by saying that it amounted to this—that they were seriously concerned because Canada lay to the north of the country that lay south of them. Now, they talk about annexation up here. We don't hear much of it down our way, and it has altogether stopped since you adopted prohibition here. (Laughter)

I am not usually in a company of this kind. Whenever

I have had occasion to make a few remarks, on exceptional occasions—for I am not a talker—I do not talk much; I have another member of my family who is a preacher, but I do the practising. (Great laughter) I am not accustomed to be surrounded by this kind of company; I am generally in the company of a lot of lawyers; and they generally fill the stage.

I remember a story—and I suppose stories are not barred here, in spite of your Imperial name. Down in New York state in the old days the lawyers used to go on circuit, just as they do in England; and they used to go to the county seats and sit around in the evening and talk about their cases after they got back from court. They had in those country taverns what they called "cannon" stoves. I don't know whether you have that up here or not. It has a convenient rail around it, and they would sit around this stove with their feet up on this rail, swap stories and have a good time, spitting tobacco juice on the stove, and so forth. Well, one snowy winter night there came into the tavern a traveller covered with snow, cold, shivering, but he could not get anywhere near the stove because it was occupied by the lawyers. Pretty soon they began to jeer him. They asked him, "Have you travelled much?" He said, "Yes, I have travelled a good deal." They said, "Where have you been?" "Well, I have been to China, I have been to the South Sea Islands, I have been to Japan, I have been to Europe, I have been to Australia"—and so on to every place in the world, almost; and one of them said to him, "Ever been to Hell?" He said, "Yes, I've been to Hell." They said, "How are things there?" "Well," he said, "pretty much as it is here; all the lawyers are drawn up close to the fire." (Great laughter)

Now, Gentlemen, I have encroached far beyond my time. I only want to express my warm feeling and to convey to you on behalf of the people over on the other side of the border an expression of the warmth of feeling that they have for you. You must not think that because they don't talk about you all the time they are not thinking about you; but they are not thinking of some of the things that you think they are thinking about. (Laughter) They have got all they can do to attend to their own affairs; but nobody ever suggests that any necessity has arisen or ever will arise for erecting forts on the 3,000 miles of frontier, or putting battle-ships upon the great lakes. (Loud applause)

President Mitchell: Gentlemen,—I think you will agree with me that that is a real Empire Club speech. I will now call on Mr. Wm. B. Kellen, Boston, Mass., also a member of the Massachusetts Bar Association.

MR. WM. B. KELLEN

Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Empire Club,—I have good news for you—my remarks will be brief. They will resemble the present style of ladies' dress, as I heard it defined by a distinguished surgeon in Philadelphia the other night, "Long enough to cover what ought to be covered, and short enough to be interesting." (Laughter) My friend, Lord Arthur, the only member of the peerage in Massachusetts (laughter), if you don't believe me, read the Boston telephone book and you will see him put down as "Lord Arthur, Main 3472," has descanted upon the merits of the Pilgrim Fathers, but he has not told you about the Pilgrim Mothers. Judge Russell, of Plymouth, at the annual celebration on the 21st of December, always gave this toast, "Here's to the Pilgrim Mothers, who not only endured all the perils that the Pilgrim Fathers endured, but they endured the Pilgrim Fathers, too." (Great laughter) He has also failed to touch upon a historical fact of importance—for my friend Lord Arthur is not only a distinguished member of the Massachusetts Bar, but is treasurer of the Massachusetts Historical Association, and devotes "fifty-fifty" to the law and to history. One of his ancestors on the maternal side was on the Mayflower, and just as that famous ship was pulling into Plymouth harbour that ancestor fell overboard. One of the seamen reached out with a boat-hook and caught him by the seat of the trousers. The trousers held. (Great laughter) They were made of a piece of English wool stuff, and they held. That was the first line in history of the Plymouth Rock pants and it is supposed to have slipped one over Lord Arthur. (Laughter)

It is a great pleasure to stand before an Ontario audience. I was going over once on the old "Saxonia", and the ship's company was made up of about half Canadians bound for Toronto and Montreal by way of Boston, and the other half by Americans. A busy man on board ship who was always getting up an entertainment came and told me that Sir William so and so was going to preside and they only wanted one speech, and he wanted me to tell some stories. I went down to the cabin and could not think of a blessed story, but finally there came into my head one that was told to me by my friend, the Bishop of Rhode Island. He said that a friend of his in Philadelphia had his mother-in-law to live with him, and she was taken very ill. Happily, or unhappily, the family physician was out of town so he sent him this despatch, "My mother-in-law lies at the gates of death; come and pull her through." (Great laughter) After that, Gentlemen I had no difficulty; other stories flowed in.

Let me give you the final sentiment. Here's to the union of the British Empire and the United States—the greatest hope of our future civilization, the greatest promise of happiness to humanity. (Applause) God Save the King; God Save the President and President-elect of the United States. (Applause)

Sir William Hearst expressed the thanks of the Club to the speakers of the day who had entertained the audience with their eloquent and witty addresses. He added that every visit of distinguished gentlemen such as these from the great republic to the south would help to link together the two great English-speaking peoples for united work in the cause of humanity and the welfare of the world. (Applause)

OUR INTERNATIONAL OUTLOOK

AN ADDRESS BY JACOB G. SCHURMAN, D.Sc., LL.D.

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, February 17, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL in introducing the speaker said,—*Gentlemen,* It is seldom that we have an opportunity of hearing so distinguished an American with such a wide outlook on public affairs as Dr. Schurman. His ripe scholarship, extensive travel, and varied experiences as educator, author, administrator and diplomat fit him in an eminent degree to speak with authority on "Our International Outlook."

DR. SCHURMAN

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Empire Club,— I thank you sincerely for the very kindly and cordial welcome you have accorded to me to-day. I cannot boast, as Doctor Stewart will be able to do next week, that I have been with you for the past three years, but I can at least say, and I desire to express my appreciation in saying it, that I have been invited to be your guest every year for the last three years and I rejoice greatly that at last I am able to be with you and share your hospitality.

In a way I am glad of the time that I happen to be with you. We celebrated last week in the United States the

---

Dr. Schurman was born in Prince Edward Island, is an M.A., London, a D.Sc., Edinburgh, and an LL.D. from eight universities. He was Professor of Philosophy in Dalhousie College; President of Cornell University, 1892-1920; President First U. S. Philippine Commission, 1899; U. S. Minister to Greece and Montenegro, 1912-13, and is author of a number of books on ethical and historical subjects.

birthday of Lincoln. That week was marked by an event which future historians may record as one of the most momentous, and certainly one of the most significant, or perhaps the most significant of modern times.

Historians are very apt to be blinded to the importance of events in their own day. In this case perhaps that is all the more excusable because this particular event occurred in a section very far remote from our horizon, but on February Eighth, South Africa voted whether it should secede from the British Empire. I say, Gentlemen, that is an amazingly significant event. It is significant, first because of the answer they gave, which was a vote of confidence in the British Empire. (Applause) I am not surprised, nor are you surprised that they answered the question as they did, because, how, otherwise, could South Africa have enjoyed so long, with firm security, the freedom and independence which she has enjoyed within the British Empire. (Applause) I was not surprised, therefore, that they declared themselves emphatically in favor of a continuance of British connections, and unwavering in their support of the policy of General Smuts, whom I, myself, had the honor of meeting and being entertained by, in London two or three years ago, during the war, and to whose exposition of the military situation at the time, and his indication of the problems which would arise after the war, I listened with profound attention and admiration. I rejoice with General Smuts that, under this leadership, South Africa has given this ringing declaration of her intention to remain within the folds of the British Empire. (Applause)

Then, Gentlemen, it is significant, because it settled a difficult question. In 1881 Gladstone was the head of the British Government, and the South African question had remained for forty years an unsolved problem, of the Empire, and he was afraid it might remain unsolvable. This is a problem which the Sphinx has been propounding to successive British Cabinets, but no solution was reached until the South Africans themselves solved it, and solved it in favor of the British Empire.

Then the event is significant for the third reason; and I think this is the most important of all. When, in all history, has any old-world Empire permitted a colony or province to decide whether or not it would remain within the Empire? This is an event unparalleled in the history of the old world. I think, on the whole, the most significant thing about it is not even the answer given by the South Africans, glorious as that is, but the fact that Great Britain permitted South Africa to formulate the question and freely vote upon it. (Applause)

I think Great Britain herself has not always taken this view of colonial relations. Her attitude from the time of the American War of Independence, down to the Boer War, had been different. This event shows the amazing advance in political wisdom, and political tact on the part of the British Government. It is an achievement for them, and it is in line with the whole course and trend of British history from the time of the Napoleonic wars. It has been a constant enlargement of the field of liberty and successive new applications of a principle. She long ago advanced beyond the idea of self-governing Dominions, and by permitting the South Africans freely to vote upon this question, she declared that henceforth the principle of self-determination is without limit for her Dominions or, in other words, Gentlemen, she declares that her Dominions are self-governing nations within the British Empire. (Applause) And I rejoice, as one born in Canada, and as an American citizen, that in this development of liberty, Britain and America have gone together step by step. The stand taken by Great Britain with reference to South Africa, is the stand the people of the United States have taken with regard to Cuba; the British policy towards South Africa is the policy which the President and the Congress of the United States have said they are ready to apply, even to the people of the Philippine Islands, and the whole world—notably the English-speaking world—has been advancing in a direction, as I have already said, toward a larger and freer life and the utmost self-determination on the part of the people to manage their own affairs and govern themselves.

I do not say that the English-speaking people have a monopoly of this development of the principles of liberty and nationality and independence in the world. From the time of the French Republic, France has gone along the same road, somewhat vainly and fitfully at first, but during the last half century, powerfully and insistingly. The principles of liberty and nationality gave rise to the unification of Italy, and have been an inspiration which has led to the advance of Italy to the ranks of one of the great powers of the world. Not only the large nations, but the smaller nations, like Belgium, and the other European Democracies have been travelling the same road, and these principles have drawn all these peoples together, so that the democracy of America, and Britain, and France and Italy, and Belgium and the smaller nations have unconsciously felt a special kinship amongst themselves in the large, general family of mankind. Not only these European nations, but the self-governing Dominions—Canada, Australia, South Africa—have been drawn into this closer union, inspired by liberty and independence, and all nations have accepted Lincoln's definition of "Government of the people, for the people and by the people".

All this time another principle is prevalent in the world, which—not to use offensive language, I may call—"anti-democracy". If Lincoln and Gladstone are the two names which we should single out as embodiments of liberty and nationality, Bismarck is the one we should at once recall as the best exponent of the anti-democracy.

Bismarck himself has told us, in his "Reflections and Reminiscences", that he had no use for Parliamentary government; that he believed in Monarchies, which he said are both above and independent of Parliament. He tells us that democracies are, from their very nature, bound to deteriorate, and that the people in democracies, when their condition becomes intolerable, will revert to some Caesarian form of government. Bismarck chooses to give a one-sided application of the principle which is as old as the ancient Greeks. Aristotle taught that when Republics deteriorate they naturally pass into monarchies; and when monarchies deteriorate they naturally pass to the opposite extremes of Republics. Bismarck chose to accept only one principle of deterioration and neglected the other, because he maintained that monarchies, in their very nature, were permanent. Under his policy, from the beginning to the end of his career, he insisted on keeping the three great European monarchies together—Germany, Austro-Hungary, and Russia. That was the keystone of his theoretical policy. And even after Gortschakoff induced the Czar to withdraw from the alliance, Bismarck still kept that before him as his ideal. Bismarck foresaw the danger to which Germany was exposed. He said "With France we shall always have war". He had despoiled France of her territory, and he knew until that great injustice was repaired, France was bound to be the enemy of Germany. "With France", he said, "we shall always have war; with Russia, never the necessity of war, unless the situation is falsified by liberal stupidity and dynastic blunders —by stupidity and dynastic blunders". Thus Bismarck, in advance, years before the war, puts the responsibility for it on Bethman Hollweg and Emperor William II, but I feel bound to add that Bismarck himself must bear the responsibility, or at least shoulder his share, because he constructed a system which only an omniscient wisdom could have worked satisfactorily. He seems to have believed that there would always be a wise Chancellor and, if only the Emperor availed himself of his services, everything would go well. The system such as Bismarck constructed, calls for a superhuman ability on the part of the Chancellor, and on the part of the Emperor, and of constant co-operation between them; for it was a system of force, Gentlemen, which Bismarck constructed, and not a system of securities. And where you have such a system of force, no one but an omniscient, omnipotent agency,—human beings being what they are—could make it successful in the long run. So Germany fell. So the war between liberty and humanity on the one hand, and autocracy and militarism on the other, ended, and, with the exception of Soviet Russia, all Europe became democratic, as China had become even before the war, and now you and I are living in a world practically wholly given over to democracy.

But we are not altogether happy in the United States. You are not altogether happy in Canada. And I do not know of any country in Europe in which they are not unhappy; famine stalks abroad in many European countries. In the rest there is dire poverty; and in proud nations like yours and mine, we are aware of the oppressive burden of taxation, and the persistent consciousness that we are worse off than we were before the war.

That is the situation in which the world finds itself and that is the problem which all nations to-day are confronted with. I have a feeling that it will be a long time before the world returns to the happy conditions—the happy economic conditions—in which it was before the war. And my ground for that belief is, that this war, which lasted for so long a time, destroyed such an immense amount of human wealth that it will take us another generation to fill up the economic vacuum. I do not believe for many a day or many a year that living will be as easy, and the mass of the people in the United States and in Canada will be so prosperous as they were before 1914. Democracy alone will not save us—although democracy is all right—but the first step necessary, I think, toward the salvation of the world is an economic step, because the misery of the world is primarily an economic misery, and the first step, in my opinion, is the adoption by the Government of the policy and practice of public economy and retrenchment in public expenditure. (Applause)

There is not a Government in the world to-day—the economic condition being what it is—that is not spending more money than it ought to spend, bringing it, as it does, from the pockets of the people. There is not a Government in Europe, with one exception, that is living within its income. I say, Gentlemen, the first step toward the recovery of the world, which is sweltering in this economic chaos, is the adoption of a rigorous practice of public economy. How each nation is to do that depends upon the Chancellors of the Exchequer, Ministers of Finance, and other financial officers. If only they feel themselves the guardians of the public purse—stewards of the capital of the country—they are not likely to make any vital mistakes, and I am sure their opinions would be re-echoed in all branches of the Administrations, and in the minds of the electorate by whom these governments have been created, and while neither I nor any one else would presume to tell the Governments of the world in detail how to practice economy, of the necessity for it there can be no doubt.

There is one point on which I believe all thoughtful men in all countries are agreed. I refer to a system of expenditures which is consuming vast sums of money, imperiling international relations and always and forever tending to provoke war. I am referring to the vast appropriations for military and naval establishments. General Pershing and Admiral Sims said the other day to a committee of the Congress of the United States that the world might to-day cut their naval and military expenditure in half. That would be a relief to the oppressed tax-payers of the world.

Now, that has been the policy of the anti-militaristic nations, like Great Britain and the United States in the past. That has been their policy. The United States has constantly proclaimed it, and in the law of 1916, in which our existing naval programme was authorized, Congress declared, and the President approved that the United States look with disfavour and disapproval on the resorting to war as a means of settling international disputes; that the United States is in favour of the policy of settling its International disputes by means of arbitration or conciliation. (Applause) And while no nation alone can embark on such a policy, there is no reason why it could not be adopted by general agreement. The question now is shall the Entente nations, who have compelled Germany to disarm, themselves disarm—or, at least, make a beginning. (Applause)

I cannot speak for any other country but my own, nor would it be proper that I should do so, but I assert that not only is the policy of general disarmament historically the policy of the United States, but practically, at the present time, the conditions are extraordinarily favourable for putting it into effect. In the first place, President-elect Harding, the other day, said that general disarmament lay, as it were, at the very foundation of his foreign policy. (Applause) I know something of that policy, for he has done me the honour to tell me that, and I think it is a matter of momentous importance when the incoming President of the United States declares that a measure of general disarmament lies at the foundation of his foreign policy. (Applause)

Secondly; the United States is already practicing disarmament in the case of the army. We had, some time ago, reduced our army to one hundred and seventy-five thousand men, which President Wilson—peace lover as he is—considered ought to be the minimum, but Congress reduced that figure to one hundred and fifty thousand, and when the peace-loving President vetoed that reduction, Congress, by an almost unanimous vote—not a Republican vote nor a Democratic vote—but an almost unanimous vote. over-ruled the President's veto and reduced the strength of the army by twenty-five thousand more men. (Applause) That shows the temper of the American people, irrespective of party, on this subject of disarmament.

Thirdly: The condition of the navies of the world offer, at the present time grounds for the utmost hopefullness for the execution of the policy of disarmament. France and Italy have navies which we may regard as negligible quantities—with the utmost respect. Russia has had no navy since the Rojesvenski fleet was destroyed by Admiral Togo in the Sea of Japan. The only navies of which practical account need be taken are the British, the American and the Japanese. Speaking for my own country alone, I say we have only to take into account the navies of Great Britain and Japan.

Now, Gentlemen, war between the United States and

Great Britain is inconceivable. (Applause) That is not merely my opinion. I hear it echoed time and again, on public platforms where I meet the leading political representatives of the nation, and remember it was one of the last words of that great American, Theodore Roosevelt, words now sanctified and glorified by his death, that "Hereafter all disputes between the United States and the British Empire can be settled by peaceful methods. (Applause)

We, therefore, have to consider only the navy of Japan. It is a smaller navy than ours but exceedingly efficient, modern, and up-to-date. The Japanese Government is in the hands of an element, partly democratic, but mainly conservative and imperialistic and militaristic. The Japanese are a highly civilized nation, proud and sensitive. The Japanese resent the treatment which their immigrants receive in the United States—and perhaps in this country. Conflicts between a white and a brown nation, under conditions of this kind, are liable to occur. Any reasonable man must admit that. But I want to set over against that analysis of the situation one or two facts. The first is this: Japan desires to settle all disputes with the United States amicably. That is not a fantasy; it is as much a fact as that Japan has a modern and effective navy. That is a fact. I know it is a fact, because I was in Japan within the last eight months, and have had opportunities to learn it. That, Gentlemen, is a fact of tremendous significance.

But, Gentlemen, here is another fact of scarcely less importance. If it comes to competition in arms and competition in armament between Japan and the United States, Japan sees ahead of her only economic exhaustion. I think the Japanese are the quickest of all nations of the world in perceiving international relations, and soundest in their judgment, and the quickest to act upon it; and for these reasons I believe that Japan will be just as anxious as the United States and Great Britain to forward a policy of disarmament. (Applause)

Before I leave this particular point, let me revert once more to the possibility—I almost feel like apologizing for it—of war between Great Britain and the United States. I want to say that my own profound conviction is there is absolutely no hope—I would not say for the civilization of mankind—but absolutely no hope for the peace of the world, excepting in concord, unity, and friendship between the English-speaking nations (applause) and that, again, is not sentiment. That is a cold fact, and I challenge any man to describe or explain the possibility of peace in the world if the English-speaking nations fall out and fight one another. I say there is no other hope for us except in such good relations. I, therefore, deprecate very much the remark which came to us the other day from London, that Great Britain and America were travelling on the road—drifting on the road which leads to war. It was all the more serious because it was given out at the Foreign Office, and by one of the most distinguished servants of the British Empire, although un-named.

Gentlemen, all I can say is this: We do not believe it in the United States. (Applause) We don't believe it. We say that the relations, so far as we are concerned, are friendly. There is no anti-British sentiment in the United States. I mean it is not general. I will say a word about that in a moment. On the contrary, in the general trend of the American mind, there is practically universal friendliness for Great Britain. There is one exception, and perhaps there may be other minor exceptions, but the great exception is that in certain places at certain times and amongst certain people—especially those of Irish descent—we do get expressions of hostility, but that will disappear when the Irish question is settled, which I devoutly hope will be in the very near future. (Applause)

But, Gentlemen, I stick to my point that the feeling in the United States is one of great friendliness, and we believe the sentiment of the British people toward America is one of entire friendliness. (Applause) No doubt the war has developed a stronger national consciousness in the United States than we had before. It developed that in Canada. You know it. You know the tremendous effect it had here. It is the same with us. But because we are more intensely pro-American than we ever were, and because we dream of greater things for our nation than ever before, and because we are going to put her in the foremost ranks of time, it would be folly to infer that we are hostile with any other nation. We are friendly with all nations in an excusable rivalry for the upbuilding of our country. We must have peace and friendship between the English-speaking nations. It is essential to the world. But that is not enough. We must embody our sentiments in an institution. The legitimate bonds which hold people together is the same as that which holds the nations together—justice and fair play.

Now, courts are the organs of justice. The first thing, then, that the world needs is an International Court of Justice—an Arbitration Tribunal. Thanks to the co-operation of American and British statesmen, the first Hague Conference, in 1899, established a Tribunal of Arbitration. Thanks to the same co-operation, in 1907, (and I am bound to add, with the assistance of Germany), considerable progress was made in the establishment of an International Court of Justice, and thanks to the co-operation last summer between British and American Governments, and the superb ability of Lord Finley and Ex-Senator Root, a way was found for the selection of judges for the great International Court, a problem which the Second Hague Conference found insolvable. I believe, therefore, it will not be long before we shall have established in the world, a great Court of Justice, for the determination of legal issues between nations, analogous to the courts within the Empire for the determination of justice as between its citizens. Wars generally arise not merely from the violation of legal rights, but from the pushing on the part of one nation of policies and ambitions which are injurious to the interest of other nations—and even injurious to the very independence of other nations.

Now, we need, in addition to the courts, some organ which shall prevent such disputes or aggressions, and anticipate them; some place where a conference of nations could be held, where the representatives of the countries could sit down and talk over their troubles, just as you business men do when business problems arise. You do not fly at one another's eyes, but you sit down in your offices and calmly consider how the difficulties are to be met, and the dangers eliminated. Such a World Conference would be an organ of justice, just as the World Court is. Such a World Conference would be an organ of good-will, and good sense, and a generally decent behavior of mankind. That is what is needed, and, Gentlemen, that is coming too. Coming? Some of you think it is here in the League of Nations. It may be. It may not altogether be. At any rate I will say that, so far as the United States is concerned, anxious as we are for an International Court of Justice, for the foundation of Arbitration Tribunals, and for the World Conference, and for the settlement and anticipation of disputes of a non-justiciable character, anxious as we are for all these things—we will not join in an organization which rests on force for its effectiveness. We believe in a League of Free Nations—I am not arguing; understand me now; I am trying to explain the position of the United States—we believe in a League of Free Nations; it must be a League open to all alike. It must not coerce either non-members, or some members of the League by others, or use force at all. It would be a League of Union; of nations united for the promotion of mutual understanding, by means of conferences and discussion, and if conference and discussion unhappily failed to prevent war, then instead of having the nations bound by a covenant to resist aggression, the United States would leave each nation free to do as it deemed best under the circumstances, as we claim the same privilege and right for ourselves. Now, Gentlemen, we think that is a world organization which will commend itself to the liberty-loving English speaking nations, and I most earnestly hope that by some reconstruction or transformation of the existing League it may be made possible for the United States to enter it. (Applause)

But, Gentlemen, there is one thing I more devoutly hope and pray for, and that is neither the League nor anything else may disturb the cordial relations and friendship of the English-speaking nations. That is the most important peace agency in the world to-day. (Applause) Never before in all history has a group of nations been summoned, as the English-speaking nations are summoned to-day—to advance justice and liberty in the world, to maintain peace and to promote the highest civilization of mankind. That is what we are called to do. That is what this epoch of history puts upon us as an obligation, and I refuse to believe that all petty jealousies and differences of policy will prevent our answering—the English-speaking nations—answering to that high and noble cause. (Prolonged applause)

REVEREND CANON CODY

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—May I, on your behalf, propose our hearty thanks to Doctor Schurman for his address this afternoon? We welcome him back to Canada, as a Canadian-born, but who is now an American citizen, and in his own person represents the feeling of good will which ideally ought to exist, and actually does exist, in a very large measure, between the two peoples. (Applause) He has won a great name and great fame for himself as a philosopher and university professor and college president, of the United States. The University, over which for so many years he presided with great dignity and ability—Cornell—has an association with the city of Toronto, through our late distinguished citizen Mr. Goldwin Smith. We appreciate all that Doctor Schurman has said to us to-day. Above all do we appreciate what is the heart and kernel of his message, that there is and ought to be common understanding between the two great branches of the English-speaking people. We believe, with him, that upon that common understanding, depends the future peace and the maintenance of world civilization. We all fought in the war for something beyond freedom. We did fight for freedom, and freedom in a certain measure has been won, but the very winning of freedom has created a great number of different points of contact that may possibly be points of friction, and, therefore, beyond fighting for freedom we are fighting, and have fought, for world organization, whatever may be the form of world organization, whether a League of Nations, or a freer League in which, as a last resort, everybody will be left to fight it out—I don't know. But that world organization must go along with world freedom is absolutely necessary if there is to be peace (applause), and we shall either have chaos in the future, or such a Utopia of peace as wise and good men have dreamed of in the days gone by.

May I, in closing, illustrate one feature of Doctor Schurman's remarks, regarding the genius and spirit of the British Empire? He spoke of General Smuts. I too had the pleasure of being entertained by the General when over-seas in 1918, on an occasion when General Smuts invited President Van Hise of the University of Wisconsin, and certain journalists to meet him at dinner. He put before the American journalists the great issues of the war. He was himself the embodiment of the British trustfulness, and when he had finished his remarks, and the dinner was drawing to a close, one of the guests rose and proposed the health of "Our host, General Smuts", and he did it in this form:—"I commanded a cavalry squadron in the South African war, and we captured a little kopje, and after capturing it, we were reconnoitering a Boer stronghold on the other side of the river. With a Boer prisoner whom we had captured, we crept down to the river bank, and he asked me in excellent English, if I had, by any chance, attended the University of Cambridge. I said, 'Yes, by a strange chance I did attend the University at Cambridge'. He said, 'Well, the commander of the Boers on the other side of the river is also a graduate of Cambridge'. Then he said 'Do you happen to be a member of the Inner Temple?' 'Yes', I said, 'by a strange chance I am a member of the Inner Temple'. 'Well,' he said, 'The commander over there is also a member of the Inner Temple', and even as he spoke an officer rode out on horseback, and the prisoner said, "There he is now'. I took my loaded rifle, and aimed at that commander with all the skill at my command, and fired, but I missed him, and the fact that I missed him gives me the opportunity to-day of proposing his health". (Laughter and applause) For that commander was General Jean Christian Smuts.

That little incident perhaps, in concrete form, illustrates perhaps better than any more elaborate words could do, the spirit of trust with which the great old mother-land has dealt with all her sons and daughters over the seas. And what has been done within the British Empire, can, and please God, will be done with all the English-speaking people, and what has been done will be done in due time with all the free peoples on the face of the earth. (Applause)

Led by the President, the members expressed their appreciation of the address by giving Doctor Schurman three rousing cheers.

GOOD WILL BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

AN ADDRESS BY MR. JOHN A. STEWART,
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF
THE SULGRAVE INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto,
February 24, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL, in a brief address introduced the Speaker of the day who said:—

Friends, and Fellow Canadians,—I should like to ask you to join me in drinking a toast to-day. I can translate the toast into English, but unfortunately my knowledge of Gaelic is not sufficient to permit me to translate it from English into Gaelic, but the toast I ask you to drink is this: "Sinn Fein," with this addition, "To us, ourselves and to everybody, good will to your neighbor?" (Applause)

That is the kind of Sinn Feinism in which I believe, in which you believe, and I think in which the good of the earth believe. It is always a temptation in coming to Canada, in this atmosphere of free-born men of lawful age to speak right out from the heart as the mind thinks. But to-day I have a message which like all messages will very likely be tiresome, but I hope it will put some-

---

John Appleton Stewart, LL.D., is Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Sulgrave Institute, New York. In conjunction with President Roosevelt he initiated the American-British Friendship Movement, organized the Hundred Years of Peace celebration committees in 1909, and in 1914 was the prime mover in the establishment of the Sulgrave Institute which was incorporated to foster friendship and prevent misunderstandings among English-speaking peoples. As head of the Sulgrave Institute, he took the lead in establishing the celebration of "Britain's Day" in the United States.

thing into your minds to cause you to think. It is about a year now since I came up here and in that time the propaganda which was then rampant has grown into a virulence and a violence and malignity that was not equalled during the war nor during the years preceding the war. I want to give utterance to the thought which I ventured last year to leave with you in order that it may impinge itself upon your inner consciousness, and that is, no matter what you may read in the newspapers of the United States, no matter what you may hear that anybody has said, remember that the United States and its people are a nation filled with good will for Canada and for the Canadian people; and that the American Republic and the British Commonwealth shall persist in association for purposes of good will no matter who may state otherwise. Now, we are going to start right in this good will matter at high noon on the 4th of March next when Warren Gabriel Harding will, upon a Bible—a Masonic Bible—take the oath of office as President of the United States.

Now I have just come from St. Augustine where I had two very delightful talks with the President-to-be and I may say without any fear of contradiction on his part that he is a man whose mind is filled with good will for the people of Canada and that during his term of office nothing will be done by him to break that good will or to sever the friendship which should exist between you and us.

During the campaign I wrote to Senator Harding, the nominee of the Republican Party for President of the United States, and I said to him, "Senator, we of the Sulgrave Institution are engaged with seventy-one other virile American organizations, in celebrating one of the most outstanding events in all history; the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers on the coast of Massachusetts and we should like a sentiment from you upon the subject of friendship among English speaking peoples, because that is what this celebration means. It is to foster friendship among those who speak the English tongue," and I received from the Presidential nominee shortly afterwards a letter which I kept in my desk for over three months because I didn't believe it to be good politics at that time to bring into the campaign, which was already running at a pretty high tension, extraneous issues, one which was not political at all, but had for its essence the creed. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"; and therefore I have kept it until the other day, when I gave a copy of it to some British newspaper men. When they cabled it abroad *it* was received as indicative of the attitude of the approaching Administration towards the matter of Anglo-American friendship. This is what the man who is about to be inaugurated President of the United States said to me: "The labor of uniting into still closer amity and understanding the English speaking peoples of the world has a significance of good to all Americans and to all nations and races of the world. Destiny has made it a historical fact that the English speaking peoples have been the instrument through which civilization has been flung to the far corners of the globe. I am impressed not so much by the glory that English speaking peoples may take to themselves, as by the profound duties that God has thrust upon them—duties of being restrained, tolerant and just. These duties will find their greatest recognition in a united, unshakable friendship, and understanding, and openness of purpose, not for the exclusion from brotherhood of others, but for a better brotherhood flowing towards others. I believe that when the wisdom of America is summoned to assist the world in building a workable, as distinguished from a bungling agreement, or association, for the prevention of war, the unity of English-speaking peoples will play no small part, not to invade the rights or exclude the fellowship of other nations, but to protect and include them." Thus, the President-elect of the United States, President Harding has been criticised for writing this letter to me. Only the other day a good English friend, a correspondent of one of the great London daily papers, said to a friend of mine, in the course of a luncheon, that he believed that President-elect Harding had been impolitic in writing any such letter as that, and when asked the reason for it he said, "Why, the moment that was published, other nations, inspired by jealousy, began to plot against the consummation which we all so devoutly wish to see." I don't believe there is a man here that will hold with any such opinion in regard to that which President-elect Harding has done. The finest thing in life, the greatest thing in the world for men and for nations, is friendship; and friendship and silence at a time of stress are as anomalous as oil and water. They do not mix, they cannot mix and they ought not to mix. The Sulgrave Institution stands for friendship. It glories in the fact that its work is in the furtherance of good will and understanding among English-speaking peoples. It believes that the good, the welfare and the progress of humanity depend upon that friendship. It believes that a policy of un-friendship is a policy of fools and that no man with the mentality of statesmanship would wilfully indulge in pin-pricks or in words that irritate; in a policy which leads to disruption rather than in the cause of good will which brings in return good will to him that gives it. But we are up against a pretty hard situation to which human nature lends itself—to which it always has and to which I suppose it always will. I got a letter the other day from a dear friend in Canada, and it was a letter blotted with tears; it was soaked in sobs as it were; and he said, "My dear friend, what is the matter with the United States?" He said, "It seems as if a conspiracy existed all through your Republic, a conspiracy of enmity against Canada and against the people of Great Britain." Well, I have lived in the United States for fifty-five years, and I have gone north and south and east and west, and I have a mailing list of people with whom I come in contact, more or less, of something like four hundred thousand, and I have never discovered a conspiracy of un-friendship against Canada among Americans, and I never have discovered many Americans to evince any ill will against their neighbors on the north. Once in a while Mr. Hearst breaks out. But if Mr. Hearst didn't occasionally break out life would lose a great deal of its gayety, and I am afraid some of the Canadian and British papers would have not quite so much to write about. Therefore, let us bless Mr. Hearst. On the other hand, occasionally Mr. "John Bull" Bottomley breaks out in a diatribe against America, and you would think from the report the immortal John makes, that war was imminent and within a week the British Fleet would sail for New York to bombard it; but nothing seems ever to happen, and our daily life goes on about as of yore. Nobody, apparently, is disturbed, and nobody minds.

Three years ago I preached a little sermon in this same room on the policy of regarding generalities as if they were concrete circumstances, to dispel the logic which puts red hair upon the heads of all the persons of a locality simply because a certain person who makes the assertion happens to meet five red-headed persons in one block on the way to a destination. Now when Mr. Hearst says something, it by no means implies that Mr. Hearst speaks for the people of the United States and because Mr. "John Bull" Bottomley says something else about the people of the United States it by no means implies that the people of Great Britain are enemies of the United States. We live under a constitution which permits a great many atrocities to be performed. The other day I wrote a reply to my dear friend "Punch", who in an epilogue dedicated to the United States of America, put down in pen and ink some pretty sharp things which showed only that the man who wrote it didn't understand his subject, and I said, "My dear friend Punch, I remember one twenty-four hours in the United States when, by resolution, Ireland was freed from British rule, Germany became dominant throughout the universe, the property of all plutocrats was divided among the proletariats—whoever the proletariats may be—I hope I am one of them—and by the same resolution men suspended natural law and lifted themselves by their boot-straps over the nearest wall; and I remember also, by the same token, being in Hyde Park when I was one of one hundred and twenty-five thousand people and by resolution and voice I witnessed the utter disruption of the British Government. I saw the Premier of Great Britain hanging from the yard arm of the ship of State, I saw all the gold in Great Britain divided among the people thereof, I saw a commonwealth of socialism established, and I saw other miracles performed too numerous to mention; all this within the short space of six hours. Now your people and my people and the people of Great Britain can do this sort of thing under the form of Government which we find best fits our conditions. They can do almost anything, they can say almost anything; and through the friendship, shall I say—or let us say acquiescence—of a police force they may even tear down the British flag from the walls of the Union Club and trample it in 5th Avenue, and they can tear down the British flag from in front of the Capitol Theatre and do the same thing; and I have known an American flag to get the same fate in one or two parts of Canada within the last fifteen or twenty years. We have never been at war over it or regarded it as the subject of diplomatic conversation; and why should we? The Irish question undoubtedly is one of the burning questions of the day, and a mighty long day at that, and undoubtedly Irish activities of propagandists lie somewhat towards the bottom of that sinister influence which is constantly furthering enmity between America and Great Britain, but not wholly. A friend of mine told me that only the other day she and a friend sat in a hall where the Friends of the Irish Republic—or whatever the particular name of the organization is under whose auspices the meeting was held—were having one of their usual talkfests, and they weren't hitting the high spots enough. They were not hitting Britain—they were not twisting the tail of the lion enough—when a voice out in the midst of the audience cried out, "Vell, vat about the Irish question?" But you know the old saying, "Scratch a Russian and generally you will find a Tartar," and that propaganda is going on with greater violence to-day than it has ever gone on before and is more detrimental and seemingly better financed, and where the money comes from only the good Lord knows, we haven't been able to find out. But yet, let me tell you, when you read any fool thing that appears in the newspaper that seems in contravention of common sense, don't take any stock in it. You and I could put all sorts of stories in papers which would be sheer lies to further an ulterior purpose, but it wouldn't get us anywhere. I tell you, my friends, and I tell my Irish friends—and there is no one would like better to see the Irish question settled than I would—that when the Irish tore down the British flag from in front of the Union Club, they did themselves more damage in America than they can undo in the next five years". (Applause)

By the bye—and I am departing widely from my text, I cannot talk to friends and preach a sermon—I have a conundrum for you: How far is the Union Club from the Cathedral? That is where the riot began, in front of the Cathedral. You don't know, you give it up, and I say, "Just a stone's throw." Get me? That is the latest in New York. (Laughter) Well now, my friends, to talk seriously on a serious subject, I tell you we do not understand the importance to the world of Anglo-American friendship. It would be the crime of all the ages if we permitted these pestiferous, insolent propagandists to separate you from us and us from you; and we do not purpose to take any stock in them, and do not purpose to believe them and play into their hands. The thing for us to do is to keep cool, keep our heads, because they want us to lose them. Don't let's do it, and every time an editorial appears by an American editor directed at something in Great Britain, that is a little snappy and bitter, that is playing into the hands of these people, and every time a British or Canadian editor notices something which amounts to absolutely nothing, and writes a bitter editorial which is spread all over the United States, we play into their hands and are simply their puppets. They want us to do that sort of thing, and don't let's do it. Now, in common with all of you, I think, I should like to see the Irish question settled but there are in America Americans who think and are recognizing the fact that underlying the Irish question are questions of race and questions of religion and questions of temperament and of inherited impulses, all of which are the very antithesis of those things of which we are a part and which are a part of us. The Irish question deals with fundamentals, and when I hear Americans say, "Why, in God's name, don't the British settle the Irish question?" I am inclined to say, "Why, in the name of the Almighty, didn't we settle the question of reconstruction in the South, where we had the same problem, and we made quite as bad a bungle of it as the British seem to have made of this, and for precisely the same reason?" Because, underlying, there is the question of race; and race consciousness is an inherited passion in the human make-up and a man, if he be a man, can no more divest himself from that sub-conscious emanation which we call race consciousness than he can divest himself of his body. It is a part of us and it is a blessing from God that it is a part of us. Back of us is a certain impulse that urges us on, and I believe that God in His mercy to humanity said, "Let the Anglo-Saxon being have mixed in him those elements of good will, of justice, of sense of fair play, so that he may be an example of all these things for all the world," and so that there may be sometime established on this earth universal government "of the people by the people and for the people," and undoubtedly at this juncture it seems that only the Anglo-Saxon peoples understand what government of the people means and what democracy means. How I wish that the Irish question were settled! I dissent from the view of Viscount Grey which appeared in the New York papers the day before yesterday, and which I assume appeared yesterday in your newspaper press, that the Irish question has dissevered America and Great Britain. I do not believe that. I do believe, and I know that all of us feel that we should like to have the Irish question settled and should like to have it compromised upon the basis of rule by the majority with a due regard for the rights of the minority that our form of government confirms and concedes. Whether it can be done depends a great deal upon good will. I tell you good-will is the greatest weapon that ever was forged for use in war and in peace, for good-will begets good-will, and love begets love, and neighborliness and kindly feeling beget neighbourliness and kindliness, and it is only by that good-will the world progresses and becomes better—anything else is a retrogression. I devoutly wish, we could settle the Irish question as if it were through the verdict of a Coroner's Jury and say, "The situation is an act of Providence," and let it go at that. Unfortunately, we cannot. However, I can say this, and I believe I do speak the mind of the majority of the people of the United States, that we all wish Britain well, and we wish her no harm, and by every means, if good-will will affect that thing, we have that good will for her which will bring her out of her trouble and which will ultimately solve the Irish question, and then we will turn our attention to more or less important things.

The other day in St. Augustine I talked with the President of the United States, to-be, about adequate celebration of the anniversary of the Monroe Doctrine, a matter of whose importance I found him fully conscious, and as to which I found him very sympathetic. Subsequently we had a meeting in the City of New York and have begun the organization to celebrate that outstanding event, not precisely as an emanation from the President himself, but as a matter in which for the second time in their joint history Great Britain and the United States of America came together for a beneficent purpose. The first was when we joined hands with you and with Great Britain and put our signatures to the Rush-Bagot agreement, and for 104 years the frontier between America and Canada has been an exemplification to all the world of what is possible if only two peoples meet one another in a spirit of neighbourliness and good-will, and for 104 years that compact has never been disputed or broken. Now, the second time when we came together for joint action for the world's good was in 1823, when President Monroe promulgated the Monroe Doctrine. I should like to read his words. President

Monroe declared, "As a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American Continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subject for future colonization by any European powers," and the implication for any disregard of this warning was war, and back of that implication was Great Britain and the British Fleet. In 1798, the Government of Great Britain conferred with the American Government upon the proposition of a joint interposition in the affairs of South America, but at that time President John Adams was reluctant to further any such undertaking. The republic was new, and he didn't believe it would be policy at that time for America to join any nation in the furtherance of any object which lay outside of its own borders, but in 1802, only four years afterwards, Thomas Jefferson said in regard to the possibility of a French domination in Louisiana, "The day that France takes possession of New Orleans—seals the union of two nations who in conjunction can maintain exclusive possession of the Oceans. From that moment, we must marry ourselves to the British Fleet and Nation, holding the two continents of America in sequestration for the common purpose of united American and British peoples." Now those are strong words, my Canadian friends, and words which those who are conspiring against British-American friendship are mighty sick ever were written. But all through American history you will find words such as these, written by the greatest of our Presidents—always the impulse in America has trended towards friendship among English-speaking peoples. The Monroe Doctrine is the very essence of an association for world welfare between the American Republic and the British Commonwealth. Later, after President Monroe had taken office, the British Premier, George Canning, brought the matter up, but at that time the Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, was not prepared to acquiesce in any such proposition, although that great statesman, Henry Clay, immediately espoused it in the halls of the House of Representatives, and in 1820, I believe, brought about the passage of a joint resolution recognizing the belligerency of the South American Republics, and later the bill was passed providing money for the erection of a diplomatic establishment by America in all of the South American countries. Later, George Canning, who was a canny man, but obstinate, and never gave up a purpose, came back at the Americans, and for the second time, and then again for the third time proposed a joint pronouncement by America and Great Britain which should warn Spain that her dominancy of the South American and Central American nations had passed by. Now the answer to Canning's activities was an agreement between France and Prussia and Austria and Russia in the Holy Alliance which met at Verona and decreed that the Doctrines of the Divine Right of Kings had always been established upon this earth, and that these four nations should use their power to continue that domination. It has ever been and always will be one of the brightest pages in English history when she said to France and Austria and Russia and Prussia, 'We do not believe in that doctrine, we stand by the United States of America in the protection of the recently established republics in South America.' (Applause) And Great Britain again proposed that we join her in a pronouncement. Now John Quincy Adams, likewise an emanation of Britain, obstinate and self-willed, said, 'No, we cannot, for reasons of policy, join Great Britain in the promulgation of any such doctrine, but we will of our own volition acquiesce in the proposition to the extent of making a declaration for ourselves which by implication included Great Britain, and which was of very great interest to her because of the existence of Canada and of her South American possessions. Then on December 2nd, 1823, President Monroe promulgated the doctrine which bears his name, and which I have already quoted. The President further asseverated that any attempt on the part of European nations to extend their systems to America would be regarded by us to be dangerous to our peace and safety, and that, as we should not interfere in

European matters, so we should resent with all our power any interference on the part of European nations in the vital affairs of the Western Hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine in its very essence, despite the assertions of historians on both sides of the water, was, after all, a joint interposition in affairs upon this continent which proved inevitable to establish upon the Western Hemisphere a form of government and a system of democracy and democratic action, the end for which we had always sought; and so Spain and the Holy Alliance ceased to trouble the Western Hemisphere, and one of the brightest pages in Anglo-American history was written. Now, my friends, the Monroe Doctrine has continued for one century. It has shown its worth. It has given to the South American Republics, to men of Latin temperament and not acclimated to the vigorous, virile rules of government which we have established in the ordering of our own households throughout Anglo-Saxondom, a freedom which they would not have had otherwise.

The Monroe Doctrine has been for one hundred years a challenge to autocracy throughout the world. It was a challenge to Germany in 1914 when she would establish her will upon the world, and it was the underlying idea, that underlying sense of common danger, that knowledge and sense of a common destiny which brought America and Great Britain together to fight again—and finally, let us hope—for the establishment of good-will upon earth. (Applause) I think it was James Russell Lowell, as American Minister to Great Britain, who gave utterance to a happy thought which has turned out so prophetic, when he said at the banquet given to American and British riflemen at Wimbledon in 1872, "Let us pray God that the rifles in the hands of Americans and of Britons will both point the same way against a common enemy, and never against each other." (Applause) Oh, how the Holy Alliance as it is established on earth to-day and as it was established on earth in 1914, would wish that Mr. Lowell's prophecy had been just the other way about, and that American rifles and British rifles had been turned towards each other and not against a common foe! Now, my friends. Canada has common rights and common privileges with us, and a common obligation in the Monroe Doctrine. I said to President-elect Harding in one of our talks in St. Augustine, "Senator, do you know what rankles in the minds of our South American friends? It is the words of former Secretary of State Olney when he said in 1895: "The United States is practically sovereign on this continent and its fiat is law upon the subjects upon which it confines its interposition." This is the thought I would leave with you after inviting you, my Canadian friends, to join us in America in celebrating adequately the second great historic instance in which America and Great Britain have joined for the welfare of the world: rather may we not now, through an international rejoicing over this centenary, publish a new interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, which shall be the very antithesis of Secretary Olney's dictum, and declare that:

"The free nations of North and South America are sovereign on this continent; their fiat is law upon the subjects to which they limit their joint interposition. They harbour no thought of aggression against the rest of the world, desiring only to be permitted to progress in the arts, customs and activities of peace, and to work out, in their own way on this Hemisphere, an enduring civilization that will bless the world."

May God Almighty bless and strengthen the good-will which underlies the associations between the American Republic and the British Commonwealth. May He by His great and beneficent power further the work which we are undertaking so feebly to bring about as between you and us, and us and you, and bestow upon us an era of good men; and good-will will be the policy of all nations. My friends, I thank you. (Applause)

WILL BRITAIN RETAIN INDIA?

AN ADDRESS BY PROF. J. L. MORISON, M.A.

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, March 3, 1921

THE PRESIDENT, GENERAL MITCHELL, after some humorous comments on the speaker's nationality and his method of spelling his name, briefly and happily introduced him to the large audience.

PROFESSOR MORISON

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—Your Chairman took me at a disadvantage because I do not deny the existence of Morrisons with two "R's" or even of those who spell their name with a "U", but what I say is, we spell it right. (Laughter) However, I think his information was right. But one thing no Scotsman ever finds any difficulty in being, and that is a complete and bigoted and fanatic Scot, and at the same time a whole-hearted Canadian—the two things are absolutely the same. When I refer to the Scottish Empire, I always like to paint the Canadian Dominion very largely in Scottish colors. The trouble is that you have annexed Scotland and not that

---

Professor Morison is a graduate of Glasgow University with first-class honours in English language, literature and history. He did post-graduate work at Oxford, was assistant professor of history in Glasgow University and since 1907 has been professor of history in Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario. He has carried on a series of studies connected with the Renaissance and Reformation in England and is the author of a number of bulletins published by the Departments of History and Political Science in Queen's University, e.g., Modern British Foreign Policy, British Supremacy and Canadian Autonomy, Nationality and Common Sense, etc.

Scotland has annexed you, and I shall look in the future to see that the Canadian rule over Scotland is better than the Scottish rule has been over Canada.

You are an Empire Club: Now, let us get right into this Indian question. Very few of us within the Empire, seem to realize that the Indian question is the most important question before the British Empire to-day. The other question that seems to dispute pre-eminence is the Irish question. You are dealing in the one case with five millions; you are dealing in the other case with three hundred millions. Now I don't care what the relative value of an Indian and an Irishman is; what I have to say to-day is general. Three hundred millions is the population, and the government of these three hundred millions is a terrific problem. There is one other reason why I ask you to consider this matter. India was one of our allies in the war. There has been an undisputed and whole-hearted support of the Allied cause from India. They freely gave in combatants and non-combatants one million men to the war. They contributed £135,000,000 or more to the running of the war and I remember, in Palestine, that when my Division was doing a very difficult job on the advance on Jerusalem, that it was an Indian Battalion that came to our help and Scotsmen and Ghurkas carried the position, cheering together. There was real co-operation, if not unity, between the peoples. Whatever India is to have as a future, we of the Commonwealth must see to it that we are not failing in generosity and gratitude. (Applause) Now, Gentlemen, the Indian problem began to become a really serious problem with the twentieth century. There were very many reasons for that. For one, of course, the Indians and ourselves are of widely separate racial stock. There always must be a certain restlessness and friction when two peoples are closely connected in one government. We have empire and we pay for empire the price of that friction; they have peace and for that peace they pay the price of the friction, and that friction always is there, just a little. Just so, for example, in Canada there always will be a little difficulty in British and French getting together. Racial identity makes a tremendous difference in ease of government. Further, you must remember that for the last twenty or thirty years India has been visited by huge famines and terrible plagues. We talk still with a certain sense of awe of the Irish famine of 1846, but do you realize that twenty years ago there was a famine in India, and that the numbers affected by that famine were some thirty-four or thirty-five millions; that plague raged in the first years of the twentieth century and that the number of dead in India was some seven millions, and without any rational reason for it? Plague and famine caused friction in Government. I think the British Government met the situation most admirably; among other people, Lord Curzon who is far too little appreciated, as an administrator by his critics.

Then again in these years the British Government had certain faults—every government has faults—and these faults, seemingly real, were used as grievances by the Indian politicians. Let me name just one or two of the specific grievances. They said, for example, that far too few Indian-born persons received high positions in the Medical or Civil Service—the higher Civil Service. Now that, I think, was a legitimate grievance that the Montague reforms are on their way to change. Again, the Indian politicians said that, in finance, the Lancashire cotton manufacturers took advantage of their position to secure favourable terms in matters of free trade; that free trade was a Lancashire protection and hurt India; that when a Lancashire manufacturer demanded an excise of some four per cent. to offset a Customs duty of four per cent. in India, that that was exploiting the Indians for the sake of Lancashire. But that, to some extent, has been changed to-day. There is a customs duty on cotton which hits Lancashire, but the Indian politicians said Lancashire was using India for their cotton goods and excluding their manufactures.

Again, they said that the Land Tax which the British Government assesses as its main item in its revenue, was too heavy. Gentlemen, when you read the Indian propaganda, I would have you note that the Land Tax in

India is not what many of them say it is. That Land Tax is really rent and, if you take the typical Land Tax-paying Indian and if you compare what he pays with what any other cultivator pays in rent plus taxes, you will find the sums come approximately to the same thing. You will find a great deal of foolish and needless criticism of Britain, because Britain is for practical purposes the land owner, the landlord of great stretches of India, and raises her revenue by a rent some people call a tax. It may be that in some places rent is rather heavy. Rents are rather heavy even in Canada. It may be that the Land Tax is too rigid, although the British Government has attempted to vary this in times of famine.

Again, the Indian politician says the British Government is too extravagant a government for a poor country like India and points more especially to the military expenditure. He says, speaking before 1914, that a twenty-one million pound army was more expensive than India could stand; but again I would point out that that expenditure not only secures peace through India but it protects the northwest frontier. Now twenty-one million pounds may seem heavy, but when you remember that under the British regime India has never suffered an invasion, that that army and these pounds are spent to secure India from Russian or Central Asiatic invasion, you can see they are getting something for their money. I have examined Indian history and compared the armies maintained by India when India was not British with the time when India was British. Before the war of 1914, the British Army—Indian and British together—was about 230,000 men, but in typical Indian periods, the armed forces of India were very much more like a million and that million represented an expense fully greater than the army the British maintain to-day and they did not secure the same order.

Then again the Indian politician says that Indian education is being run on western lines and that the old glories of India—and they were great glories—and the traditions of Indian literature are not sufficiently attended to; but, Gentlemen, there is not time to go into all these many details. The normal running of a government produces grievances, always produces grievances everywhere. These grievances were used and are still being used by agitators to create a certain friction. The most obvious point about these grievances is that they have been specific. When you know what you are driving at, it is easy to defend or attack, but when you don't, you are rather in a fix. Now many things occurred in India in the last twenty years to cause an extraordinary unrest.

England made up her mind that India should be educated. There have been many faults in that system of education; many of the policies pursued were wrong. But, remember this, that the English Government, from the first, understood that education would quicken Indian self-consciousness, would make British control more difficult, and yet they maintained the educational system. Go back to the beginning of the nineteenth century. It is one of the most outstanding incidents of that day when Sir Thomas Manley said, "We are trying an experiment never yet tried in the world—maintaining a foreign dominion by means of a native army and teaching that army through a free press that they ought to expel us and deliver their country." Free press! free education! We frankly and fairly faced that situation. Now education has been operating, you may say, since Lord Macaulay's time in 1835 and everywhere throughout India education has created a political class and the ideas they got were ideas they got through their education—British political ideas of freedom, independence, of responsible government—and the Indian people quickened to the impulse of education and government became more difficult.

While all this was going on, outside India great events were taking place which still further complicated the Indian situation. In 1904 and 1905 Japan suddenly appeared as a primary power in the world. Now, no Anglo-Indian with whom one speaks ever shuts his eyes to that great victory of Japan. It taught the Asiatic he could be as good a man as the European. In those days, Russia was second only to Germany as a military power. Suddenly an Asiatic state brought the pride of Russia down and all over the continent of Asia a sense of Asiatic self-consciousness sprang up, which was acutely felt and is still felt in India. Again, a little later than the Japanese war, there came great constitutional changes in Turkey, Persia and China. Take the Young Turk movement in Turkey. There, the Turkish nation seemed to be on the verge of a great era of democracy. As a fact, it was commencing a new period of bitter autocracy at the hands of Enver Pasha and his men, but the Indian mind failed to grasp this—they looked to the beginning, and they said what Turkey has, India must have also. These Asiatic movements made English government very difficult indeed.

Then came Lord Curzon's vice royalty. Now Lord Curzon is a man of whom it is difficult to speak quite fairly. He is a singularly irritating politician. No place where he has gone speaks very well of Lord Curzon. He has a curiously irritating manner, but he is one of the best informed politicians within the Empire and I venture to say if you examine the administrative record of Curzon in India, you will find very few measures that were not highly beneficial. It is a tragedy that two of the greatest reforms in modern India's history—the attempt to make the Province of Bengal a more efficient Province and the attempt to change and better the whole university life of India—should be taken up by the nationalists and made, as it were, oil on the fire of nihilism, and yet both measures were justified, although highly irritating to the Indian public. The consequence was that Lord Curzon went home and Lord Minto went out to India in 1905 but India was seething with an unrest, the causes of which were partly specific and definite and partly also indefinite and very difficult to meet. Lord Morley did his best to face the situation. Morley's reforms filled in a gap. There are men that say that Morley and Minto did things that were not much use. The fact was simply this—the situation was startling; no remedy was quite possible for all the troubles. Lord Morley and Lord Minto with perfect patience and caution and wisdom introduced a palliative measure, and so things were until the war.

Gentlemen, with the War, which after all has changed history in a way that few of us to-day are aware of, came a tremendous awakening of India, a period of over-development, by generations, and made the task of the government very difficult indeed. Lord Morley's reforms, increasing the number of councils in India and the number of Indian members in these councils, taught the Indians something of politics, and the Indians wanted more to say in the political world of India. A class which represents the Hindus and the old Indian Moslems, representing seventy million Mohammedans, organized themselves and began to define what they wanted. Meanwhile, there were other and more serious factors in the situation. Mrs. Besant and some Indian assistants started a highly mischievous home rule campaign. They were crying to a very large extent for the moon, and the trouble is when people do that they sometimes think they are crying for what they can get. Mrs. Besant has recanted from her heresies, but too late; the mischief has been done. Then there was the Mesopotamian campaign and the Indians tell us that the publication of the inquiry into that first disastrous campaign created a great deal of disquiet in India. We were fighting the figure-head of the Mohammedan world and every stroke we struck was a stroke that disquieted India and created a curious sort of revolt in the hearts of our Mohammedan fellow-subjects there; and then came the momentous day, August 20th, 1917, when Mr. Montague in the House of Commons made a promise of self-government to India and promised that in gratitude for the Indian services in the War that that unrest would be made the subject of legitimate constitutional claims. Gentlemen, let me say this, there are men in the Empire to-day who are talking Hindi Semitism; you had one in Toronto recently; you have another one in London, Mr. Belloc. I think we have had quite enough of that tomfoolery. (Hear, hear) Gentlemen, the British Empire stands for absolute inclusiveness. We are prepared to take the services of any man who will be faithful to our King and Commonwealth and I count him a traitor, a knave, who will bring in racial differences in the service of the Empire. (Applause) You will find the less worthy organs of British opinion finding fault with the fact that Mr. Samuel is in Palestine, that Mr. Montague is in the Indian Office and that Lord Reading has gone to India to govern the country. I say that the Empire that found Benjamin Disraeli—with whose opinions I do not at all agree—that the Empire that permitted him to take care of the honour of our House of Commons is prepared with many more important places for as many such Jews as the Empire can provide.

Well, Gentlemen, here we are to-day, first of all with a promise of Mr. Montague, secondly with a scheme by Lord Chelmsford and next with an irritating and provocative Viceroy. There are two ways open to Britain in India to-day. One leads to partition and separation; the other, to my mind, to mutual development. I have no hesitation in saying my whole support and I think your support must be given to the reforms that Mr. Montague introduced. What is the programme of possible constitutional development of India? It is this: First of all, the Montague reform has determined that all over India there shall be local councils, little local councils, corresponding to the old village community, and that these shall have very large local powers. From these councils, England hopes to create an educated political body. Secondly, India is divided into provinces. The British Government has selected these provinces, which might correspond in a way to the Canadian Provinces, as a constitutional experiment. At present, the idea is that the matters of government shall be divided into certain subjects controlled by direct responsible ministers—ministers responsible to elective assemblies. Other subjects will be controlled by the Governor, who is an Englishman. As the Indian proves his capacity for government, subjects that were reserved to the British Governor will be handed over to the Indian public, so that after the Indian proves that he can govern himself, the day will come, and that day will be welcomed by the British Government, when every Provincial subject shall be disposed of by an Indian responsible minister. That is, as it were, the centre of the whole matter. Thirdly, in order to maintain order and peace during this period of experiment, there will be at the centre, that is at the Viceroy's court, the strongest possible superintendency of the control of the three hundred million men, women and children. You cannot play fast and loose with so great a body of humanity. And the British Government asks—and I think asks rightly—that during this exciting moment of experiment the Viceroy and his Executive Council shall have full powers. In order that Indian opinion may not be excluded, the new reforms have grouped round that central power a Legislative Council representing the provincial opinion, a Council of native Princes and a Privy Council, and when the day comes that India has proved herself fit for complete self government, that central government will respond to the claim and Britain will give her full responsibility. Fourthly, in order to make India as Canada is to-day, an independent and really autonomous unit, the Secretary of State in India, that is the Parliamentary Secretary, I should say, in the House of Commons, is to have his powers very largely modified. India is to governed by a Viceroy with his Council, by the Provincial Council, and by these local boards. The whole emphasis of Mr. Montague, and I take it the whole emphasis of Lord Reading, will be ever on the side of giving the Indian more and more control of his own affairs, and the only thing that can prevent the Indian people from ultimately possessing autonomous rule will be their own unfitness, which I believe does not exist.

What is the alternative? Let me say first of all the scheme has faults. Every scheme has. The point is, not that it has faults, but will it work? Look back to your own history in 1841. The 1841 scheme in Canada was a bad scheme, but it has worked. Between 1841 and 1867, Canada discovered what she wanted. An experiment was made. Canadians have gained my respect more and more as men of common sense and practical purpose. You do not go in for nationalist follies, you mean business and generally get what you want. Now just as 1841 was followed by 1867, so I take it in India the reforms of Montague will be followed by a more accurate scheme evolved by men seriously playing the political game. If a man tells you there are faults in it, never mind the faults. We want a working scheme, and I believe that if we get a working scheme with men working that scheme, the result cannot be anything but happy. In India we are faced with a determined challenge to the British experiment. Everywhere throughout India revolution and wild nationalism has spread like wildfire. The head of that world is Mr. Gandhi, a very high-minded, spiritual, and—it seems to me—highly destructive political force. You will remember that while the purely constitutional movement was going on we were inactive, and from the schools and colleges little bands of boys and students were going out trained to hate England, to make English government impossible, to break up the existing system. There is a letter from a school boy which I have read. He had no hate of the English, he had no grievance, he said that specifically, but he was, as it were, so filled up with nationalism as to want to go out and bomb people, just as the ladies at present adopt the latest disfigurement of Paris as the custom. These boys are being fed up with this, the first step in which is crime.

Mr. Gandhi says he is for passive resistance. He says he is pacific, but we all know that sort of pacifist who causes more destruction in the world than any fighting man you come across. Notice what happens. Mr. Gandhi started his great agitation for peace as he called it. He excited the whole Punjab, which was the heart of the spirit of India. We passed certain restrictive measures; Mr. Gandhi pushed on with his agitation still further and through that agitation, the situation that occurred at Amritzar became possible, and Dyer put it down in his vigorous way. I think General Dyer made the mistakes that the Hunter report said he did, but he did proclaim his presence and he did repeat his prohibition before he fired. I think when General Dyer fired on the gathering he fired too long, but, mark you, the man who caused the situation which came to a crisis in Amritzar was Mr. Gandhi, through his passive resistance movement.

To-day, all over India, there are non-cooperating organizations headed by the Gandhi movement; in other words, they have made up their minds they are going to bring the British government to an absolute standstill. The schoolboy has to leave his school if it is a British school, the student has to leave his university, the lawyer has to cease pleading at the Courts, no one is to appear as a candidate for the elections under the Montague scheme. Well, Gentlemen, it is a very easy thing to upset a government, a very much easier thing than to make a good, new government—and the talk of Gandhi now is to free India of the Montague-Chelmsford Scheme which has to be operated in the face of the most bitter cruelty, of wild revolutionary and Bolshevistic nihilism. Are they to have their way? Are we, as we have been called by Mr. Peacock, the biggest tyranny in the world, a race of traitors and brutes and Prussians? Gentlemen, upon examining my own heart, and I am sure you are doing the same, I fail to discover the brutality and the tyranny that people tell us are inherent in every British breast; in fact it is not there.

What are we to do? I think there is one thing in front of the British as an obvious duty, so that the Indian public may ultimately govern itself. I think we believe that the Indian public can govern itself and should be educated to do so and as many of us believe, the Montague reform was like the Durham report, the beginning of a self-governing Indian world. Gentlemen, if we believe that and if we trust our own motives sufficiently,—I think we do—and if we are determined we will not use force when force should not be used, the one thing for us to do is to say this: we are governing over three hundred million souls in India and we are governing so that they may ultimately govern themselves.

We will give them step after step towards complete autonomy but we will not be hurried; we will not be terrorized into any rapid process of development; we will take our time which is also their time. That seems the proper thing. It means possibly the use of force. I am almost sorry, sometimes, that the Prussians have spoiled force as a moral thing, for there are times when force is a moral thing. I think General Dyer must have used force in his case, but I say this, if we have the cold world to face that we have to face and come into contact with forces of dissension, Bolshevism, and revolutionism, we have got to use force; and if we have enough moral character, we will in this case of India, hold on to our programme of right, and determine that no one side of that programme shall be omitted, and will challenge the revolutionists and say we intend our way to be carried out and that their way must break if it stands in the way of ours.

One last word. In conducting our great constitutional experiment—and, Gentlemen, I am proud to belong to a commonwealth that is doing more for the science of government and the development of liberty than any other government I see in the world—I say in pursuing our experiments in this great political laboratory of the British Empire, we will have no outside interference. (Hear, hear) There are a great number of anxious friends outside (laughter) who are not only inviting us to adopt their ideas but who are going behind our back to assist these nationalistic movements, which they misread as being steps to liberty. Gentlemen, the time is coming and has nearly come when we as the British Empire will be worthy to be thought of as a League of Nations. We believe in developing every member of our commonwealth within, but we will have no interference whatever with a scientific experiment, the end of which is British liberty, and that is the final word I will say on the Indian question. (Cheers)

The President expressed on behalf of the members their hearty thanks to Professor Morison for his illuminating address on conditions in India, the members giving the Professor three rousing cheers.

PAYING OUR WAR DEBT WITH TIMBER CROPS

AN ADDRESS BY MR. ROBSON BLACK, SECRETARY
CANADIAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto,
March 10, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: At our last meeting when you remember Dr. Stewart, of New York, spoke, this Club sent a telegram to the new President, Mr. Harding, on the day of his inauguration, conveying in that message the sentiment that, as a result of his message to this Empire Club through the medium of Dr. Stewart, this Club wished to convey its congratulations to the President and show how much they appreciated the message which he sent to us through Dr. Stewart, and expressed the hope that the kindly, neighbourly feeling between the United States and Canada would always continue. In response to that message I have to-day received the following message from the President's Secretary: "The President has read with deep appreciation your kind message, and he asks me to assure you, and through you your associates, that he is very much gratified by your good wishes." We have been listening during the last few meetings to addresses and sentiments of Empire. To-day we turn our eyes in another direction—to our own Canada, and to the empire of our forests, because it is an empire, and by a transferred epithet, the Empire has in our empire of forests a great asset which we hardly yet appreciate. To-day we are to listen to a short address by Mr. Robson Black, the Secretary of the Forestry Association, who will tell us something about this forest empire of ours, and how valuable it is, and what we must do to get for our Empire the best out of our forests.

He will first speak on the subject, and will then follow with some moving pictures, which I am sure you will find intensely interesting. Mr. Black has made a careful study of this subject, and I am sure that all of us will very much appreciate and be much instructed by what he will say.

MR. ROBSON BLACK

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—The subject to be considered to-day is one that covers about a million and a half square miles in area, and is about as deep as civilization itself; and we have got twenty-five minutes to commence, get to the middle, and then follow to the end. You can take two ways of looking at a tree, according to your disposition or your pocket-book; you can consider it as poetry or as pulp-wood. There is probably a third view, the one in which we are chiefly concerned, that is, of a tree as a member of a mass formation that we call the forest—not as an individual shade tree, but in that regiment of trees that we term the forest. This is, to us, the only thing worth talking of to-day. This forest represents to us not a private business of some limit-holder or the raw material of a sulphite mill, but the incredibly rich public asset that in the Province of Ontario, in regard to the land area, is owned by the people to the extent of about ninety-two per cent.

Now, we know the casual view of a forest is that it is a patch of spruce, hemlock, pine, off somewhere in the great distance in the northern part of Ontario, alienated from all concern of ours, belonging to some so-called lumber baron; or else we conceive of it as a pleasant place to camp in, a good hunting ground, a group of spruces or balsams—always belonging to somebody else, and with perhaps a Royal Commission singing in the branches (laughter); or at other times, whatever definition you can give to these various casual points of view, they are always pretty well insulated from the ordinary business of the mass of population in southern Ontario.

We are often asked when forest conservation is going to cease being a subject of discussion and when somebody is going to put a chassis under it and an internal combustion engine into it and set the thing going. There is not any quick prescription that can be given for forest conservation, and no one can write a formula for the forests of Ontario that will rejuvenate them, or protect them from fire. It is a long process. You can briefly state that forest conservation in the first stage is a state of mind; and when you have got the state of mind, after that you can proceed to raise the waste out of its present status as a sort of renegade relative of the family of resources, into the very front rank of public policies. Until it is elevated and put there, and until the job of forestry management, considering the forest as a crop, self-reproducing for all time to come, until that job of forestry management is brought into the very forefront of our national economy, we cannot look for any rapid or real progress along the lines of forest conservation. We must realize that it is not a lumberman's concern or a pulp and paper concern, or as a privately-owned timber limit, but that the forest resources of Ontario are public property.

In the United States they devised what they call a national forestry policy. They face to-day a relative timber famine that must close out from 3,000 to 5,000 saw-mills in the southern States within eight years. The pulp and paper industry in the eastern States is doomed to extinction; it has not that little triumvirate of water powers, spruce forests, and practical rail connection to the market that is typical of our Ontario conditions. Their forests are petering out in the eastern States. Now, under the alarm of what is to come, they have devised the national forest policy. The most awkward barrier they face in putting that into effect is this fact—that three-fourths of all the timber of the United States have been definitely alienated from the State; they have no control whatever over three-fourths of their entire timber resources; they would pawn almost anything, except the exchange rate, (laughter) if they could get the condition that we enjoy at the present time, by which nearly nine-tenths of all the forest lands of Canada are vested in the name of the people of Canada. (Applause) It is true that our timber is alienated on the nine-tenths of the land which we own, but that fact can never alienate from us the responsibility of the State acting as the general manager of the forest areas and their chief conservator.

Now, I cannot emphasize too strongly that we are concerned in forests from the point of view of the public responsibility for the perpetuation of forest areas. We are interested in that as the universal raw material that contributes to the comfort and business health, whether we grow peaches in the Niagara peninsula, or build ships, or dig coal, or operate waggons or motor cars. In every case this universal raw material acts as balance-wheel of every constructive activity we have in the Dominion. There is the further consideration of its identification with the whole economic life of Ontario or almost any other province. We have some grounds for apprehension when we see each year this red tide of forest fires passing across our forest areas. It is a fact that forest fires have stripped us of about two-thirds of the original forest resources that were given to us without any labour, without any investment or trouble on our part, about a hundred years ago.

Facing that fact, facing the fact that we have given over to fire just a million square miles of our Canadian forests, as against a mere hundred thousand square miles that have been stripped by the axe, and made useful to our Canadian lumber men—ten to one in the favour of the fire fiend—facing that fact, surely we have some grounds for feeling that this problem of forest protection and forest maintenance constitutes a problem of first-class importance, and ought to rank as one of the very first policies before our provincial government.

There is, of course, the poetic side, the imaginative side to the forest. In the forests of California at this moment, you can find giant sequoia trees that breathed the same air and saw the same sun rise and set in the days when the children of Israel went down into Egypt, and long before it; 4,000 years have passed over the heads of some of those trees that now stand in the forests of California. I mention it only for this purpose—that the persistence of life in an individual, as we see it there in a rather picturesque form, is somewhat like the persistence of wood in the ordinary every-day needs of mankind. For every substitute that comes on the market, for all the iron and the asbestos and the tin that you see advertised, the use of wood through the whole world increases enormously. For one illustration, we are using to-day vastly more wood in ship-building than in the days when all the ships of all the world were made of wood; and that applies all down through the line. You can find this persistence of wood in taking even things that seem remote from the forest. Here is the farmer, let us say, seven miles west of Swift Current, where trees are not particularly abundant. He goes to the land with all the energy and agricultural skill in the world. He faces his land, but before he becomes a productive unit, he must be given the coupling-pin between man and land, of a wooden barn, a wooden house, wooden furniture, wooden fences, wooden fence posts, half-wooden farm implements, wooden churn, and so on. Practically a little forest must be joined to the farmer facing his land. Consider this in relation to fisheries. The fisherman stands on the shore of a sea that bubbles with fish, but he is quite helpless as an economic producer until you give him a wooden boat and wooden boxes and wooden barrels, wooden sheds, a railway that runs over wooden ties, and so on—all those running in the line of communication back into the forest.

So with our railways. Unless we have every year about 20,000,000 track ties, the railways cannot carry on. So with the telegraph companies. One of those companies, I think it is the C.P.R., sticks up about 50,000 poles every year. The other day, by the way, one of the Bell Telephone men in charge of maintenance said that his difficulties in the past three or four years to get right material for his lines were so intense that the other day when he read in the Montreal Gazette that the Poles were all concentrated on the German border he was prepared to believe every word of it. (Laughter)

The newspaper may seem an isolated business unit; but to-day commerce is based upon advertising. The centralization of production, plus a nation-wide distribution, is based entirely upon the power of the daily newspaper to create markets and distribute goods, that is of course, markets in business lines. Now, a newspaper, in its raw material, is just a flattened-out tree. Unless you can find a pile of pulpwood every year that runs 9,500 miles long, standing about so high and four feet wide, it is absolutely impossible to carry on the newspaper industry of this country. We have to have 40,000,000 newspapers run off the presses every day of the working week in the United States and Canada. It is rather interesting to bring this back to terms of forestry. The Chicago Tribune in every Sunday's issue cleans off fifty-six acres of Canadian forest. A large New York newspaper does about forty to forty-five acres, also of Canadian forests; and any man that has any affection at all for a tree ought to see the final result of his tree when it is pressed out and printed.

Of course some men get extraordinary ideas of what can be done in utilizing this marvelous provider—the ordinary spruce tree. The Kaiser had his idea, and in the middle of the war when food was getting pretty scarce and they wanted to conserve all the scraps that were ordinarily thrown to the dogs he asked three or four of his wisest and cleverest Berlin Professors to devise a sort of synthetic dog food, taking hemlock bark and treating it, and adding saccharine and some other substances. So after six months of very close research to save the dogs, they announced in one of the Zeitungs that at last the brains of Germany had devised a synthetic dog food, consisting chiefly of hemlock bark; upon which Punch, of London, copied the item and stuck this characteristic little line under it: "We should have thought such clever researchers could make those canines subsist on their own bark!" (Laughter)

Now, for just a moment to get outside of our own country—because foreigners, in their researches, have a very definite lesson for us, the general principles of which can be adopted in this country, though of course not all the details. Take a country such as Sweden and Norway. They have found that half of the total area is utterly useless for farming, and they have set that half aside to do the one job that nature intended it to do, that of growing timber trees. (Hear, hear) They have a forest that automatically almost recuperates every year what is cut over. In other words, your lumberman can cut as he pleases, but five years after his cut he must show sufficient natural growth or artificial growth on that area to satisfy the state that in times to come that will repeat the original stock of that stand. (Hear, hear) Now, we may not be able to adopt such measures here in their entirety, because the economic conditions are quite different, but the principle of it is observed also in France, where a quarter of the total area of France is definitely set aside as a timber-producing estate. It is not any good for agriculture; it has no mines in it; it will not grow vineyards; so they make it do the one job it will do, and that is to grow timber. You remember in the war how the foresight of the Frenchmen in planting forests a century ago was so effective that they were able to cut down about 50,000 trees a day for five years to feed the front-line trenches of the lines with wood materials.

So with Switzerland. That little country is following out that principle of efficient management on every possible acre. It is all a matter of the use of land, and towns in Switzerland and towns in France have applied that principle—that a forest area, a square mile shall give us a crop to-day, and it shall be so treated that while the axe cuts the immediate crop to feed the mill, it also cuts out the pattern of the future forest; that is, while you supply your mill to-day you will make sure to supply the mill from that same area in 50, 100, or even 200 years to come. (Hear, hear)

Now, you may ask what this has to do with Canada.

It has this. As I said, it is all a question of the right and efficient use of land. Though it does not appear in guide-books or in railway literature, eighty per cent. of Canada's total habitable area, taking out the boundaries to the far north, is non-agricultural. In New Brunswick and Nova Scotia the percentage runs about seventy to seventy-five per cent. that will never take a plough and can never turn in revenue to the public unless it is kept doing the job of producing timber. In Quebec; to-day out of 250,000,000 acres of their area, excluding Ungava, they have just got under plough 15,000,000 acres up to date, and they have had a long time to search out all the farm land in that province. In our western provinces, not a third of the total of the three prairie provinces is an agricultural soil. There is an enormously wide strip in Saskatchewan, about 30,000,000 acres that is destined for one thing, and that is the production of timber. In British Columbia, they have not got five per cent. of the area that is agricultural soil.

Now, the creed of forestry, the creed of the conservationists, amounts to this, that every township that will take a farmer and take farms ought to be set at that job as soon as we have population to undertake it. There is not a lumberman or a forester, a pulp and paper man in Canada in his senses that asks, for timber, one single acre of land that will produce farm crops. All he suggests is that the land that is no good for farm crops ought to be kept producing timber. That is not unreasonable, and in this day, if it is kept doing that, it is almost instantly automatically translated into terms of timber industries. Just six years ago, in northern Ontario, an area of square miles now occupied in the municipal boundaries of Iroquois Falls—some of you have known it—was just a howling wilderness; no population at all, no good for farming, of course. But in came a pulp and paper company into the wilderness of northern Ontario, bringing in $10,000,000 to $15,000,000, of American and British capital. They camped there for only one reason—that they had that little triumvirate of spruce, plus water-powers, plus good rail connection to the nearest newsprint market; and on the site of that wilderness of yesterday they have a full-orbed little town that hands out in wages $4,000,000 a year—all the product of retaining spruce areas in that section of the country. (Applause)

Now just one word as to the peculiar situation that faces Ontario since the newsprint mills of the United States have found that they must move somewhere to some extent, and that northern Ontario and northern Quebec offer them the ideal location for a mill. They have depleted the forests of Maine and the New England states, very largely. They have gone across the continent, and the pulp and paper trades have depleted the forests of Michigan and Wisconsin and considerable of Minnesota. Now, the centre of gravity of the lumber industry of the United States is in the pine areas of the southern States, which, according to the President of their Southern Pine Association, must give up 3,000 of the present saw mills inside the next ten years—due to depletion.

Now, that ill wind of Uncle Sam's is a trade wind for the Canadian industry. Since we retain in northern Ontario and northern Quebec the thing they want and must have, it is only a question of time until the centre of gravity of the newsprint industry in America is moved across the border and established on this side of the line. (Applause) The only condition to that development, that we ought to look forward to, is that we should retain our forest estate. (Applause) We have the water powers, we have the rail facilities leading right down into the centre of newsprint consumption. The only destructible element in that group of advantages is the forest. It is the one resource that can be easily and has been very largely destroyed by human carelessness. It is the only thing that calls really for immediate action on the part of the whole people of Ontario. I would just like to say this, that notwithstanding the so-called bush-whacking process in northern Ontario, there are still very considerable areas that must eventually be cleared of timber. But taking the Dominion as a whole, that bush-whacking process that was all right in the early days, has prevailed long enough; so that, taking our country from coast to coast, we have more acres that have been stripped of timber and must be put back under timber—a laborious process—in order to pay a profit, than we have acres now under trees that can ever profitably be stripped for farming. The shoe of the pioneer is on every foot at the present time.

This thing all comes down to one illustration—that of Grand Forks, a town which happens to be on the other side of the boundary, but the story of Grand Forks is potentially the story of any land that owns timber and lets it go by this useless way of fire. Grand Forks fourteen years ago had a population of 13,000 people; to-day it has a population of exactly sixty-five. It had a fine lumber mill, a church, schools, all the machinery of a complete, happy municipality. Grand Forks has been blotted off the map, and what the municipal bonds are selling for, I have not the slightest idea. Grand Forks arose because of the forests, it was prosperous because of the forests, it fell because the forests fell away from Grand Forks. To-day you can get an eight-roomed house—I have this on authority of the financiers—for $300, and a man will throw in his orchard and barn, and his neigmbour's place, too, if you will only come and take it. (Laughter)

Now a word as to forest fire damage. It is the cruel side of the picture of the Canadian forests, and yet must be mentioned. Just running over it very briefly, we have handed over through flame in British Columbia twenty-two times as much timber as has been utilized by all the mills in that province since the province was first founded. We have killed in the prairie provinces eighty per cent. of their original timber resources. Ontario's losses have never been brought down to a statistical basis, but the rate of destruction in the northern part of this province has of course been very severe. One of the lumbermen—some of you may know him, Mr. Gillies, of Gillies Brothers, appraised the loss in just one fire that ran through a perfect white pine area between Mattawa and North Bay, and, when they measured up the loss, it represented the total consumption of their white pine mill for fifty-six years—from one fire that took one week to burn. That figure of utilization of wood is not a drop in the bucket compared with the useless destruction of wood by this enemy, the forest fire.

Now, if we keep in view this identification of the forest wealth of the province with every commercial activity, we can understand that the fight now being waged not alone by our Forestry Association, but by your own Forest Government Branch, and by forward looking men such as Mr. Drury, deserves the utmost public support. (Applause) During the next ten years we shall advance in this province towards either one of two goals. In our great estate to the north that represents about two-thirds of our province, non-agricultural land, we will secure from the vast enlargement of the present pulp and paper and lumber interest a multiplication of present towns, a great influx of new and prosperous population; we will develop, if we have sense enough to get technical education and multiply metallurgists and chemists in the country by twentyfold; we will utilize in distinct industries the waste products of our present crop of wood-using industries, and set up thereby 100 or 1,000 new industries themselves. This will react beneficially on the agricultural industry of southern Ontario. That is the dividend which, in this insatiable wood-using age, is paid to any province—Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick—in gold if it will retain the one thing on which those industries and population are founded, namely, the forests. We can choose that as one option.

Or, if we surrender those beneficial gains I have mentioned, we must surrender in addition—because they cannot stay with us—at least part of the lumber and pulp and paper industries, and their dependent wood-using industries that are now in existence and form part of our commercial fabric. If we kick out the timber prop that stands underneath the forest industries of Ontario there cannot be any other possible end. We kill the export trade which to-day has a limiting power on United States exchange of about $400,000 a day. If we take the area which runs, roughly, from a line at Ottawa to Georgian Bay, and with certain local accessions north of that, and suppose the local industry taken out, we can mark that off as a No Man's Land forever. Now, those two options have been held up to us for a long, long time by sheer good luck; but there is no man acquainted with the forest resources and the rate of fire loss in the past few years who believes that this choice will be held open much more than five or ten years more. This does not raise the bogey of timber famine, because we may not be able to see the timber famine when it comes, on account of the trees. You can consider that in this way—that a forest area has only to be relatively exhausted, the timber-stand just approximately depleted, before the cost of getting out logs per acre renders the operation practically prohibitive. We have mentioned this in the beginning, and I will mention it now as purely a phase of the matter. You may ask, why a phase of the matter? Because the forest, quite unlike agriculture, has the long-time element, crossing, bridging whole generations of human life from the birth of the tree on to maturity; and only the state with its continuous life and undivided purpose, that does not grow tired, and is not supposed to vacillate—only the state can, and only the state in other lands has been found to act successfully as the natural custodian and administrator and perpetuator of those various lands. In this country the state is kindly to all limit-holders, so that we must accept in this country, as European nations have already accepted it, the principle that agriculture is not the natural business of the Government; with its quick annual return; you can leave it to a man to look out for it, and to the productivity of his farm, all by himself. But the forest is a totally different concern—a thing that bridges generations between infancy and maturity—when you come to consider it in all its aspects, defies all the motives by which human beings invest their money or go into an undertaking. Before an individual in this hall could put his money into a plantation and see it mature, 100 years and two or three generations would have passed by. As a matter of private initiative and private investment, it is rather poor business. So that in all lands—and equally it must be in this land—the job of forest perpetuation must be assumed as one of the natural functions of the state. (Applause)

Someone asked me to-day to mention something of what was actually being done in the pulp and paper industries. I can put it in two sentences. The pulp and paper industry throughout Canada has definitely committed itself, as an industry, to the perpetuation of forest lands, on the permanent production basis—the basis of sustaining yield; that the square mile shall deliver timber to-day, and be kept in such a condition that 150 years hence it will keep on delivering interest out of the capital stock. The pulp and paper industry is just as diligently in search to-day of a programme, a formula for the perpetuation of forests, as any provincial or Dominion Government.

Let me add just this in closing. What the fire protection system amounts to is this: We have a fairly good outline of protection in all the provinces, but the outline needs filling in. We are the fillers; you and I are the people. The citizens of the province do the burning, set the fires, and are accountable for the destruction; and we are very apt to call the fire ranger a lazy rascal because he didn't happen to be on the job when we were most dangerous. Now, the moment the people of Ontario say they want forest conservation they will get it. The thing is an accomplished fact. When the people of Ontario say that this is an incalculably rich asset grown on publicly-owned lands, when they say it belongs to the people of 2,000 A.D. a little more than it does to the people of 1921, the job will be all finished. The weakness at this moment is that not enough Ontario men, with the typical Ontario tenacity, are willing to get up and say that, and say it out loud. (Applause)

(A number of moving pictures were then shown, depicting the carelessness of smoking in the woods; children lighting picnic fires in the woods, and not putting out the fire properly; passengers on a train throwing cigarette stubs into the woods; careless motor party leaving fires smouldering; fire rangers and their methods of detecting and stamping out fires; lumber operations at Spanish River, etc.)

A hearty vote of thanks was given the speaker.

THE OLD COUNTRY RE-VISITED

ADDRESS BY PROF. JOHN MACNAUGHTON, LL.D.

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto,
March 17, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: For the past few weeks we have gone about the Empire and about the branches of the Empire, and to-day we are to have a trip together into the heart of the Empire. We are going to merry old England, bonnie Scotland and dear old Ireland. It is particularly fitting, as following Sir Philip Gibbs' address before a Toronto audience three nights ago that we should have to-day in the Empire Club another viewpoint from one of our own Canadians who has so recently visited the Old Country. In Dr. MacNaughton we have an old friend who is well known to all of us, who has been connected with the University life of Canada for many years, and as Stephen Leacock said, in proposing his health when he was about to come to Toronto, "Long may he be spared to circulate amongst us." (Laughter) So you can see the esteem in which Prof. MacNaughton is held not only in our own University but in the other Universities of Canada. I have very much pleasure in calling upon him to address you.

PROF. MACNAUGHTON

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I must plead guilty to being not an Irishman but a Scotchman. (Laughter) I

Professor John MacNaughton, M.A., LL.D., was born in Aberdeen, Scotland, and took his Arts Course in Aberdeen and Cambridge Universities and his Theological Course in Edinburgh, with further study at Heidelberg and Berlin. He held the Chairs of Greek and Church History at Queen's University and later was professor of Classics at McGill University. He is now professor of Latin in the University of Toronto.

dare say it is quite unnecessary for me to give you that bit of information. But I belong to that tribe of the Scots that really are practically Irish—the Highlanders. You know the Irish started to speak Gaelic lately, after they had given it up for many centuries, but in my part of Scotland we kept it up all the time, and never said anything particular about it, either. (Laughter) So that it is not so inappropriate as it might appear at first sight that I should speak of Scotland to-day, and during the summer one of the most interesting parts of my visit was in a part of Scotland that made one think very much of Ireland. I was right in the Highlands of Scotland, close to a place where Prince Charlie landed in 1745, near Moidart. That was the last rebellion worth speaking of that took place on British soil, and it was my countrymen, the Highlanders, who took part in it, and they made a good job of it (laughter) and I think it is a good omen for Ireland that, though in those days the Highlanders hated the English worse than any people in the world, I suppose, and though no English prince ever was so hated by any considerable fraction of British subjects as was the butcher of Culloden, as they called the Duke of Cumberland, instead of those bitter feelings of that time there is now no section of the British people that shows a more enthusiastic loyalty to the Empire or who took a more distinguished part in the war than those very Highlanders. (Applause) It took them a good while, but they did at last succeed in doing what I hope our Irish brothers will do—in recognizing that under the peculiar exterior of our friend John Bull, which is not always very attractive at first sight, there lies a great heart and a sweet blood, and that in the English people there is a real sense of justice and love of liberty not only for themselves but for all other peoples in the world. (Applause)

I had not been to the Old Country since 1912, and in a way I felt just like Robert Louis Stevenson's Scotchman, who was celebrated in his poem, "The Scotchman's Return from Abroad", which emphasizes two things—that his absence from home brought him in contact with things he did not at all approve of, and there were two things that he could never get to suit his taste when away from home—whiskey and religion (laughter); neither of them was nearly strong enough for him (laughter) and his great delight in getting home was to renew his acquaintance with those two palladia of his dear native country. But I think even Stevenson's Scotchman would have been struck by some other different things, different aspects of things, if he had left with me last May in the good ship Melita from the port of Montreal, bound for Liverpool. I think even he, though a very uncompromising Scotchman, and little inclined to recognize that any other people amounted to a great deal would have recognized on board that ship that after all, there was something in the English people. For one thing, in the development of our Empire they have a particular specialty, and that is for the sea, and no doubt the Scotchman would have to admit at least that they had taken chief part in that, although of course he would have made out that they had been helped very vigorously, as was the fact, by Scotchmen.

But on that ship one could not help thinking that, after all, here was a great part of the secret of our victory. These people—these stewards, these officers, that captain, men like these, women like those women stewards—they were a great part of the explanation of our recent victory. (Applause) One of them in particular, with whom I came into pretty close and intimate relations, was an extremely imposing gentleman who waited upon our table, and he looked as if he might have been a bishop (laughter); I could scarcely bring myself to accept his services owing to the depths of my reverence for him. (Laughter) To my mind he stood, as it were, as the visible type of those people who during all the years of war, in spite of submarines and deadly and treacherous and absolutely illegal menaces, never refused to sign on, but went to sea without giving the Germans the pleasure of supposing that they were in the very least degree terrified by them, went about their business exactly as if there were no submarines in the world.

(Applause) A great deal of the triumphant result of the war was due to the way those men kept the sea open for us; and of course it is due to the British fleet behind them to say that they were their necessary support. One felt, from the moment of boarding that ship, that he was coming in contact with the old country and especially with England, at a very vital spot. That impression was still more confirmed when the ship reached Liverpool and the Mersey. The sea was the secret of our success. We could say, as Miriam did in her song:

I will sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously;
The horse and his rider hath he cast into the sea.
They sank like lead in the mighty waters.

That was what happened to our enemy, and the enemy of civilization:

They sank like lead in the mighty waters.

I think the historians will say that that was the vital point; it was surely the sea-power of the British army that was the real and profoundest and most important cause of our victory in the war. Just think of this. It was the fact that we had the sea open that made it possible for us Canadians to take the part we did; that enabled our good friends the Americans to take the part they did; that is as true of them as it was true of us. This continent, which we particularly associate with Liberty, which has always boasted that it is the Land of Liberty, could not, but for that fact, have taken any part whatsoever in the greatest fight for human liberty that was ever fought in this world.

Just as we sailed up the Mersey we came across the most speaking proof of what I am saying—the embodiment of that sea-power that had saved the world; that was the rather remarkable little craft that stood before you as the speaking and living emblem of the mighty power of England—the little passenger boat called the Daffodil one of the two little Liverpool passenger boats that take you for a sail around the harbour for sixpence any day you like. That little boat was one of the two that took part in one of the most remarkable instances of the war, one of the greatest achievements of all naval history, namely, Zeebrugge. (Hear, hear, and applause) Some people have almost forgotten that event; indeed, I met two American gentlemen who were our good friends all through the war, who had never heard of Zeebrugge. It is worth while for people to hear about it, and I hope we will never forget it. (Applause) I don't think that any other people who ever lived in this world would have attempted that task, and certainly I don't think any other people would have been able to pull it off. What did it consist of? The point was to block the passage at Zeebrugge—a long tortuous channel silted up with sand, through which it was almost impossible to find your way in. The first thing to be done was to sink a ship or several ships loaded with cement and block that passage and stop the rats' hole; but in order to do that, two other things had to be done. First, that long sea mole that guarded this channel made it impossible for any ship to pass, for it bristled with cannon, was brilliantly lighted electrically, and communicated with the main-land, and there was a great hotel there from which it could get reinforcements at any moment. Secondly, they had to clear the mole of its cannon. Thirdly they had to cut off its communications with the shore. Thus there were three distinct and separate impossibilities. Anybody would have said they were wild to attempt any of them. There were three distinct and separate impossibilities, each of which had to be carried out, had to be carried out together, had to be integrated—the integration of three impossibilities was the task. But they did it. They sent the ship down there and sank it right in a fair way. They sank two, as a matter of fact; they landed the "Vindictive" by the sea-mole and cleared it completely of Germans, and that ship sailed home under its own steam. (Applause) Furthermore, they did what was perhaps just as remarkable as any of the other achievements—they cut off the viaduct which connected with the mainland, and made it impossible for reinforcements to stream in, as they otherwise would have done. They pulled off all those impossibilities, and they pulled them off together, by the combination of precision in execution with absolutely unlimited daring in conception, absolute dare-devil courage to begin with, to face anything, even impossibilities, and precise timing—a combination which, I make bold to say, is not to be found quite so prominently anywhere in the world as in the British Navy. (Loud applause)

We should not forget these things. We should not forget our tremendous debt to the British Navy. I do not think that we in Canada are likely to forget it, and our cousins on the other side ought to be more aware of these facts than they are at present; it would considerably increase their respect for us, I think. Gentlemen, omit no opportunity of letting them know about it. I never do. (Laughter and applause)

When we landed in Liverpool, if there had been any green grass around, or anything attractive, I think one would have been tempted to fall down and kiss that sacred soil, that inviolate soil on which no foreigner has ever set his foot since the other William—William the Norman, the Conqueror—landed there in Thetford Park in 1066; inviolate through all these centuries, and holding so much of the destiny of all mankind. Yes, one would have been inclined to kneel down and kiss that soil.

Then I went to London, but did not stay there long, for my real object in going over was to visit France, where I had to look out two graves, and I had to go to a part which was well known to our Canadians; we heard a great deal about that ploughed salient of Ypres, with Bercouse within a mile of it; and then one was reminded of the other great contribution it was given to our people to make not only by sea but by land. You know what was said of that by Foch; he said the annals of history have no more glorious records than that of the 110 days of continuous offensive fighting which was done by the British army, and which brought the war to a close. (Applause) That is what Foch was reported to have said, and whether or not he said it, it is true—smashing the Hindenburg line with the spear-head of the British army—the Canadian corps.

There one saw graves, graves in dreadful desolation. There one saw the desolation of all the buildings; scarcely one stone left standing on another. There is no more depressing kind of ruin in the world than the ruin of brick buildings; I think there is something peculiarly depressing about them. And yet, where else in the world could one choose to be buried? What more glorious place of burial is there on all the face of the earth than where thousands of our boys lie? I know of no place where I should be so proud to be buried as in that desolate and dreary spot surrounded by all those others. I am glad to say that those graves are being gradually brought to order now. In France I saw one of the completed cemeteries, and really it was very beautifully done. You know the general plan of them; they are scattered all over that part of France, and hundreds and thousands of our boys lie buried there. Every single soldier, whether officer or private, has a stone exactly the same, with the arms of his regiment and a few words on it; then there is one great altar stone with the inscription, *"Their names shall be held in everlasting remembrance."* Opposite that there is a cross with a sword entering into it, and never in all history did the cross and the sword go so well together as it did over there and never was the right of the sword to be consecrated on the cross so well justified as in this war.

Then, of course, one had many reflections there. Around Ypres, was the peculiarly deadly part for our Canadians, and one felt: What a loss we have had in those boys, our very best! What a loss Canada has had. Yes, indeed, a great loss, a loss to which there is no way of doing adequate justice. But a great gain, too; a great gain! After all, those young men could certainly in no way have laid out their lives, if they lived one hundred years, each one of them, to more advantage for Canada and for the world than they did there. It is difficult to count up these things and strike a balance, but one thing must always be remembered—to hold on to that faith that the gains from such self-sacrifice and self-devotion are unqualified; that the gains of the cross are absolutely endless.

Then, when one returned to London, there were many things to be thankful for. There are all the old tokens of that great old civilization. Even the journey between Dover and London brought that fairly before one's mind. There is no more delightful country in the world, none laid out with such an eye to simple beauty. In France the country seemed dominated by a very severe utilitarianism; every spot of ground was utilized, and that was one thing that struck us very strongly in France, the extraordinary careful farming of those people. One felt the force of the saying that was going around at that time, "Farming is going to save France," and that is true. However early in the morning you went out, you saw those people working on the land and by the last rays of sunlight the people were still working like ants. That dreadful region around Ypres and Albert we saw in undistinguishable ruins except for an occasional estaminet, or "pub", which seems to be the first thing to strike the green land that shows itself over the ruins. But in the country round you could not have told that there had been a war at all except that, here and there, on the side of the road you would see a heap of barbed wire. Those people do not go in for six or eight hours a day; they are at it from morning till night, and already they have resuscitated their country to such an extent that you can scarcely tell from the fields that there has been any war at all.

When travelling in the comfortable train from Dover to London one felt, "This is really a civilized country, old and civilized, with a matured and sweet civilization which can only be produced by thousands of years." I remember the story of an American who saw some of their beautiful lawns in Oxford, and wishing to reproduce them at home, he said to a gardener, "How do you do this?" and the gardener answered, "You roll it and cut it very closely and water it very carefully for five hundred years." (Laughter) That was just the impression one got of London; there you were in the midst of civilization that belongs to us as much as to anybody for we paid very dearly for our share of it. Here you were in a civilization that was mellowed and grown old, and that stretches away back to Moses and to Homer; and one could not help feeling that it was a great heritage indeed, and worthy of some sacrifice.

Then in London one saw Westminster Abbey and the great treasures of our English-speaking race wherever they are, the records of our nations' really glorious past, and the lines of Wordsworth came irresistibly into one's mind:—

It is not to be thought of that the flood
    Of British freedom, which, to the open sea
    Of the world's praise, from dark antiquity
Hath flow'd, "with pomp of waters, unwithstood,"—
Roused though it be full often to a mood
    Which spurns the check of salutary hands,—
    That this most famous Stream in bogs and sands
Should perish; and to evil and to good
Be lost for ever. In our halls is hung
    Armoury of the invincible Knights of old:
We must be free or die, who speak the tongue
    That Shakespeare spake; the faith and morals hold
Which Milton held.—In everything we are sprung
    Of earth's first blood, have titles manifold.

That was what one felt there—that there was, as it were, the central throne of the great traditions of this race—this race that has sent out its sons by all waters, spread them all over the world, and wherever they are, there is freedom and justice and decency. (Applause) One felt that in Westminster. Of course our enemy tried to get at Westminster and St. Paul's. They did manage the Post-Office which was quite near, but they never touched either Westminster or St. Paul's; those priceless heirlooms from the great past were absolutely intact.

Another thing I saw which seemed to me to be very characteristic of our victory, which gave one a blessed assurance that we had been victorious after all, that this terrible nightmare had passed away and left us comparatively whole and intact, and that was the greatest cricket field in all the world. Cricket, above all, is a characteristic English game, and I had the pleasure of witnessing a first-class cricket match at Lord's. Then I felt the country was safe. (Applause and laughter) It was strange that one of the men who was playing, and playing very well, was a grandson of Alfred Tennyson, our Poet Laureate—playing in a way that was worthy the verse of his grandfather. Now, supposing those gentlemen who thought they could manage things so much better than we can had come out on top, this would not have been going on; all of those young fellows would have been going the goose-step, every man jack of them. (Great laughter) That was one little incident which strongly impressed the reality that after all, in spite of danger, we had really breasted the storm.

A good part of my time was spent in Scotland, in the country where Prince Charlie landed, at Moidart, one of the most beautiful countries in the world. There is something about the Highlands of Scotland that I think is not to be repeated. There is a peculiar quality of beauty there that is not found anywhere else. No doubt it is largely due to the extreme humidity of the climate, which, though disagreeable in some ways, has that effect of producing a certain atmospheric condition of softness of sky and a certain lustre. Things there seemed to me to look like pebbles under water, so to speak. They have a gloss and a lustre such as is not found anywhere else. There, again, I was reminded in a very remarkable way of what we had been through. Most of the people at the hotel where we stayed were engaged in fishing—not that they caught very much. I didn't trouble fishing. I simply climbed the hills, and as the Scotch say, glowered frae me—stared just in front of me, and that was occupation enough, for the scenery was not the same for five minutes at a time. There was mist on the haystacks now, and then sunshine, and a change every moment. We were remarkably lucky in having weather that gave us the full beauty of the place, and I found quite sufficient occupation in climbing the hills. One of the young men who was staying at the hotel was a certain Captain Scott, and in talking one night about the various regiments and countries, and how they had done in the war, this very modest, quiet fellow did not say anything, but at last he piped up, "Well, now, I think that the lot I was with myself did about as well as anybody." "Well, who were you with?" —he had never told us before—and he replied, "The 52nd Highland Division. (Applause) I should think they have done about as well as anybody". He told us that a great many of them came from just that part of the country there—Camerons and McDonalds. He said they were very quiet fellows, you would not think they would have "scrap" in them; they read their bibles and that sort of thing, a lot of them, very quiet men indeed, but, he said, "Put them against Germans and they were regular devils." (Laughter) I was proud of my native country, proud of the part Scotland had taken. I had always been proud of it, but never so proud as then.

One of the main thoughts suggested by that visit to the old land was that that old country is the heart and centre of the Empire, a country that has done so much in the world, and done so much for the world; that country that has broken the back of every tyranny that menaced Europe, from the time of Philip of Spain, in Queen Elizabeth's day, down to William the Second of Germany. In that country we have a great inheritance—that country with its traditions, its beauty, its old culture which it maintains so freshly with such vigour without losing any of its ancient manhood or force, which has been so abundantly shown. We may well be proud of that great inheritance which belongs to us just as much as Vancouver or British Columbia does. (Applause) It is ours by the double right—by blood, for thank God we have never cast off our allegiance. (Applause) It still lives in us as freshly as it did the day our ancestors left those old shores. And what beneficent results have come from that allegiance — this great result among others, that Canada was enabled to take the glorious part she did in the most critical issue of all human history. Through that connection it was natural for Canada to take her part, and she did not hesitate a moment to do it. Thanks to that connection, to the living force of it, which was more alive than any of us knew until it was tested—thanks to the living connection of that vital bond, Canada was enabled to take her glorious part in that greatest event in all history, and I have no doubt that the beneficent results of that co-operation will be increasingly manifest, even from the material point of view. We have not only the right of blood, that is, the right of natural inheritance to that old land, but we have the right which is greater, the right of the blood that our sons have shed for it. It is a great thing that we should belong to that ripe and mellow and ancient civilization and be heirs to those great traditions and noble ideals that are still so vigorously maintained by the old country.

Another reflection I am sure has occurred to many people as well as to myself, and that is, that we have a very respectable approximation, just as things stand, to a League of Nations. That British Empire, to maintain which is the object of this Club, and from which the Club derives its name, that British Empire is badly named, for really it is not an Empire in the sense which those words are apt to call up; it is not like any Empire that has ever been in the world before. In reality it is a league of free partners. It is of very remarkable construction. It has grown up in the course of centuries, and is there as a fact in the world to-day, and it was a very remarkable system, and structure, which really corresponds with the realities of the world as we have it. It is composed of peoples who have perfect freedom, perfect independence, some of its members are absolutely free to manage their affairs exactly in their own way, like ourselves in Canada, like South Africa and Australia, absolutely free to go our own way—to go to the devil as we like—which is a great privilege for Irishmen (laughter) we are free to do exactly as we like, as free as any in England or Scotland or America—a great deal more free possibly; an individual has a great deal more freedom here than he has in the States. That is one of the great things about that system—it represents individual liberty. That is one of the great things worth conserving, too—that respect for individual liberty, that love for individuality that is sometimes even a love of eccentricity. That is one thing that struck me tremendously.

I used to go around Hyde Park and hear those soapbox orators and tub-orators talking all kinds of treason, and nobody said any word to them; the policemen paid no attention to them, but just allowed them to work off their steam. There is no country in the world where a man can say the thing he will as freely as in England, no country where the respect for the individual is so deeply ingrained in the very structure of the people, in their minds and almost in their bodily frames. That is one thing that our neighbours have not, however excellently they have, in other ways, kept up the old ideas; that is one thing in which they have not yet attained to the same pitch that England has, namely, the freedom with which a man can say what he likes, freedom from the popular stampede.

I say, then, that we have a League of Nations which really corresponds to the actual facts of the world. Some members of it are already capable of managing their own affairs without any interference whatsoever, and have absolutely full liberty to do it, as we have. Others there are not quite capable yet, and to whom it would be no kindness to give absolute power to manage their own affairs. There are people like the Egyptians and the Hindoos that are, as it were, in the position of wards and the Empire has its place for them and does look after them, to their obvious and enormous advantage, so far as material things are concerned. How much more prosperous and well-to-do the Egyptian people are on account of the great work that has been done there on the material side than they would have been under any other conceivable reign! Furthermore, while holding those people in their present state of tutelage, the

Empire keeps open for them the ideal of self-govrnment and extends it to them just as they become ripe for it. That is the character of this great system to which we belong, and which has done such great things for the world.

Gentlemen, I think it will be the verdict of history that in the great crisis through which we have recently passed our Empire saved the world. That was the rock on which above all others the power of Germany split. One might have supposed that all that was needed was simply to extend it to a certain amount. The French had practically joined it, to all intents and purposes, Italy had, even the Russians had come in. They had all practically come into this great association of Nations. Even America came in for a while. President Wilson thought that he had a better League of Nations in his head. It is said that Clemenceau said, more or less by way of a joke, that Wilson imagined himself to be a kind of Messiah. Now, I don't think there was any harm in him or in any of us trying to be just as much of a Messiah as possible, every man of us; I think that is what it is our business to be. The trouble about President Wilson's Messiahship was that he wished to be the sort of Messiah who dispensed as much as possible with the Cross, and wanted to do with very little except the Crown. Poor fellow, he has had his share of the Cross lately. But at any rate, Gentlemen, he tried to bring in this ideal organization of all the peoples in the world that was going to bring about the good times, the happy days, for the world, and restore the age of gold. This has very largely failed to come off; but the old League of Nations, our League of Nations, the League of Nations of which Canada is a part, is still there, thank God. (Applause) It is now engaged in paying for the war in which it fought, and it can do it. It surely could do the fighting, and it can do the paying, too, if we all work together, if we all energetically co-operate, if we keep together this great system, to the utmost of our individual power, and work for it to the best of our ability. If every man of us does that, and if the greatness and power and promise of it is realized everywhere by people like ourselves, then I do believe that the great task that has been laid upon it, and that still almost crushingly bears upon its shoulders, is not too great for its ability to bear. (Loud applause)

MR. KENNETH J. DUNSTAN expressed the hearty thanks of the Club to Professor MacNaughton for his interesting address.

THE OPEN SHOP; WHY IS IT; WHY SHOULD IT PREVAIL?

AN ADDRESS BY MR. JAMES A. EMERY,
OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto,
March 24, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: Gentlemen, we are fortunate to-day in having to speak to us, Mr. Emery, of Washington, one of the best-informed experts on labour questions in the United States. As you will see by the notice, he has given a great deal of attention to the particular subject on which he is to speak to us. We have the good fortune, also, to have with us the Hon. Mr. Rollo, Minister of Labour in the Ontario House, (applause) and I am sure we very much appreciate his presence. During the past few weeks, as I have said, each week in succession we have had presented to us various phases of Empire affairs. Now we are back into questions that are more intimately concerned with our own immediate part of the Empire and our own immediate life. The Labour question, taken as broadly as one can take it, is undoubtedly one of the paramount questions before us as citizens and as a nation. Only yesterday did we read in the despatches from the Old Country Mr. Lloyd George's appreciation of the labour situation as it is to-day in Great Britain, and all of us who have read it could not

---

Mr. James A. Emery is a widely-known lawyer of Washington, D.C., who has specialized in industrial practice in the United States. He is Counsel for the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States, the National Industrial Council, composed of State organizations of manufacturers, and the National Founders Association. He addressed the Empire Club in 1907 on "Problems of Industry and Labour."

but be impressed with the importance of the problem which has to be worked out before things get on an even and equitable basis for the near future. I am sure you will listen with great interest to what Mr. Emery has to say and again I want to say how much we appreciate our good fortune in having him with us to speak to us to-day.

MR. JAMES A. EMERY

Gentlemen,—I want to take a brief interval of your time, in the hope that the subject may be worthy of reflection over a longer period. I realize that many topics comprehended within my subject are difficult of dispassionate discussion. It embraces many colliding interests, strong prejudices, opposing theories. It deals with relationships fundamental to the economic, the political, the social life of the individual. It begins with man's most intimate concern—the gaining of a livelihood—the first necessity with which he is confronted, for all men must earn their way save those few who are fortunate enough to be, in part, inheritors of the individual success of others, but even they must conserve and carry on. We face an antagonistic nature from which we must win our wants. We find among the first and most individual questions confronting us the relationship between our wants or desires and our capacity to satisfy them. The history of our race is one of continual struggle with the forces of nature which yield reluctantly to the labour, guided by the knowledge, talent, and character of man. His reward has been and ever shall be in terms of his capacity to produce and hold beyond the needs of subsistence. That is the tale of individual progress; it is the story of every race and nation. We see, too, that the direct application of individual energy gained small reward. Man sought constantly new means to multiply his own strength He learned the nature and operation of the vast forces about him. His progress is measured by the growth and application of that knowledge. Today the forces that aroused the superstitious fears of our ancestors are the hand-maids and the bond-slaves of our comfort. We trace the material progress of our society by the growth of its power to multiply production, to build a surplus above subsistence that may be used in the development of our processes, in the experimental labour of the scientist and the inventor, the expansion of reproductive industry, the spread of the liberal arts.

Surplus wealth is an essential of economic progress: not merely material life, but all the finer and nobler things of human nature are dependent on its production and conservation. Without it there is no literature nor art, nor science, nor free and liberal culture, nor the frequent monuments of organized religion. Without it we are savages pursuing the immediate support of life. Possessing it our society masters its material surroundings.

This thing in all its forms is but that capital so sharply criticized in the labour discussions of our day, a fundamental necessity if there is to be progress. (Applause) What is it but labour applied and accumulated and possessing new productive capacity? So every man is, to a large extent, the inheritor of the capital builded up by the labour of the past. He is born to-day into a world of aeroplanes, of swift communication, of rapid transit, of multiplied mechanical capacity for production, confining the lightning and harnessing the falling flow of the mountain stream. He finds a ferry on the ocean; the mountains pierced or levelled; the night lighted with a million suns; the air carries his whisper; a million ghostly fingers instantly obey the touch of his hand. All these are the estate of every new infant. But all this has wrought great changes in human relations.

It is a curious paradox that our very progress in multiplied capacity for production has made us individually less independent and more inter-dependent. The Europe over which the vast war raged was a very different one from that over which Napoleon marched to his Waterloo. That was a Europe of independent self-supporting agricultural communities. The Great War was waged in a Europe of inter-dependent industrial states. Victory in that war did not go to the nation with the largest population, the biggest army, the hugest natural resources. Russia possessed all of those long before she became a debating society but she could neither produce for her own needs nor distribute that with which her allies supplied her. She broke down under the test that a modern industrial society must meet—of being able to produce or procure and distribute its needs. Now, if the material prosperity of society is to depend on sustained power of production, the form of productive relationships that is economically best is most tremendously important to every element in society. Each state forms its own concept of its rights, its obligations, its ideals, its moral and economic tasks; these must translate themselves, if they be true and living forces of life, into every relationship of that society. If not, then there comes antagonism of parts, in which instead of each performing its own function in the complex structure of modern life, some element moves at variance with the whole, and we have political and economic wreckage instead of political and economic progress. We can violate the laws that man writes, and avoid the penalty; but history, the recorded experience of man, teaches us that just as surely as individuals, groups or nations violate the natural laws of life they pay the unavoidable penalty. (Applause) The difficulty is to interpret the laws of nature and of nature's God to make clear the way.

Now, the people of your blood and mine have developed a society during a thousand years of struggle to secure the recognition and perpetuation of something they believed a fundamental, political, moral and economic truth; and that is the inherent worth, dignity and nobility of the individual life and that the individual is the dynamo of social progress. No great movement in society went forward except an individual led, stimulated or inspired it. As the French say, "Seek the Woman" we say, "Seek the Man"—he is at the bottom of every progress. Our political institutions were established in order that our state created by man might serve its only purpose as his agent in preserving and perpetuating the rights which our fathers believed essential to the forward movement of the races. They believd that if the individual were stimulated to do his best by a hope of secure participation in the fruit of his efforts, that he would make the most of himself for those dependent upon him and in doing so must inevitably advance the society of which he was a part. (Hear, hear) That theory has been practically tested by generations of successful life. We have applied it not only to the men of our race, but to every blood on earth that sought our shore, and through the operation of these principles we have developed through the centuries the material and political progress we enjoy.

Now, if these things are true then any theory that has to do with the co-operation of men in production and distribution of wealth must reflect those principles, political and economic, or it cannot be Canadian, and it is not American. They are the acid test of worth. Now, what is the employment relation? It is a contractual relation between management and men engaged in rendering a service or producing a commodity. The parties can be paid only out of what they jointly produce. Nothing is more certain than this: if they don't put in they can't take out. (Applause)

Now, all are under the necessity of earning a livelihood. Out of this necessity arises two fundamental rights. One is that every man is entitled to select and pursue any lawful occupation or business. The other, that he is entitled to advance his interest by entering into any lawful agreement with others which they are willing to make with him free from molestation or arbitrary interference. For civil liberty, as men of our blood have understood and practiced it, is that a man is to have the power—not merely the right, because men may have a right and not be permitted to exercise it—to work out his temporal salvation as he sees his interest, restrained only by his conscience and by equal, just, and impartial law under representative institutions. (Hear, hear) And not only are these fundamental rights of liberty, but, when exercised in the selection of an occupation or calling, or the making of a contract, they become his most sacred property for they are the levers for the upward lift of life.

"Ah, but"—you tell me—"men don't start equally". Of course they don't. You cannot have liberty and economic equality, because men vary in every physical, mental and moral quality. The moment they begin to exercise liberty they create inequality. It does not assist our discussion at all to say that we are after "economic equality", or "social equality", or by whatever phrase you undertake to describe the desire to equalize men. You can't do it. (Hear, hear) That is the reply of nature. Those who persist in such an unnatural purpose would destroy in the individual all that our institutions were established to protect. (Hear, hear) What injustice is greater than a proposal to reward equally unequal men? What proposal could be socially more hurtful than one to reduce all the contributing agents of society to a common level? The contributions of a single individual have lifted the whole level of the race, at times, more than all the efforts of his fellows over a decade. The great inventions that revolutionized the control of man over nature, that made possible all these tremendous agencies that are at our disposition to-day, always originated through an individual somewhere. He who has the greatest stake in the preservation of free effort stimulated by hope of reward is the man at the bottom of the scale, because it is he that receives the greatest benefit in comfort and opportunity enlarged from the effort of such minds, wherever they work. (Applause) The way to injure the mass of men is to stop, obstruct, dam up the natural movement of those great human contributions in which all participate.

As our society has grown more complex in reaction to industrial development, men have associated together to co-operate in their work, in their play, in their worship, in their amusements, in the creation of the state, in the direction of it. No more useful tool of social advancement had been found than the co-operation of men to obtain a common object by common means. But when they do associate for that purpose they cease to be a mere aggregate of individuals. They become in terms of the power which they exercise in their relationship, either to other individuals or to the state of which they are a part, a new moral entity, a personality, which has an efficient capacity to obtain its end in exact proportion to its success in subordinating the individual will and judgment of its human elements to the common method and purpose of the organization. Such association we call a combination—the generic term—of which conspiracy is its illegal or immoral species.

Whenever men associate together they create a capacity to do good or to do harm, to help or to hurt. They establish, of necessity, power which they can use or which they can abuse. They can fashion one of the most tremendous instruments of social benefit or they can turn that power into one of the most dangerous weapons in the social armoury. What we are most concerned about in combinations is their nature and methods and that they shall live in subjection to the society of which they are a part. It makes no difference whether the combination is one of workers or of employers, a corporation or a labour union, it must live in subordination to the public interest. (Hear, hear) Now, if that is a criticism of any particular organization which rejects that standard, all I can say is, so much the worse for the organization. (Laughter) You cannot perpetuate institutions like ours if any group be permitted either to make itself superior to the state or an exception to the general operation of its principles of control. The moment you do so you begin to tolerate the growth of an independent and alien power, outside the sphere of political control, steadily tending to set its interest above that of the great body of society. This becomes an exceedingly serious matter as social life becomes more intricate and interdependent, as each man, under the circumstances of to-day, goes about his daily task, performing his specialty in the perpetuation of life, and confidently relying upon everybody else to perform his function in the social machine. What can you and I do to-day to supply ourselves with food, fuel, light, heat, or transportation? Nothing, except to accumulate enough to keep us ahead of to-morrow's demand. We are dependent upon agencies that we have created or patronize and upon the uninterrupted and efficient operation of which the continuity of our life and its very character have become dependent. Society, as a matter of self-defence, therefore, possesses not only the right, but the obligation to control its agencies in the public interest. The public interest, while a clearly-affirmed abstract principle, must be defined in terms of the circumstances of the day, because, while that interest is always the same in the sense that society is defending and conserving its life, conditions to be met vary. Hence, law, to be a living and efficient rule of conduct, must be able to meet those changing circumstances, and sufficiently elastic in principle to meet them all.

These descriptive phrases we so frequently fling around in social discussion do not mean much unless we can translate them into something practical. A man is called a Radical or a Conservative. Just imagine George Eliot's "Felix Holt, the Radical" to-day! He would be a hopeless reactionary. We need Radicals, if Radicals mean those who go to the "roots" of things; but if by Radicals is meant, men impatient of social speed, who cannot always distinguish between motion and progress, they do not help, they hurt the cause they claim to serve. (Applause) But, returning to a consideration of association of effort, there is another phase to set in our back-ground, that is the relation between those who invest, those who direct and manage, and those who, under that direction and supervision, engage in the co-operative task of production. There cannot be, as I see it, any real conflict of interest in regard to the necessity for production; the conflict arises when you come to divide the proceeds of that production. (Hear, hear) Now, I assume as I proceed that I am talking to men who believe, no matter what position in life they occupy that private property is essential to the perpetuation of individual liberty. (Applause) We hear much discussion to-day about "the dollar being above the man", about the rights of property being considered more than the rights of persons. Well, that is a very loose way of talking, after all, because there is no such thing as a "right of property". There is the right of an individual to property; and as one of the few great truths that came out of modern Russia I offer that observation of a great Russian—"that liberty and property entered the hut of the Serf together". You cannot think of a free man unless you can think of a man who can be secure in the reward of his efforts; (applause) that what he has struggled for is his, and it is not only his for his own use, but in accordance with the exercise of social virtue he shall be able to save it and to transmit it to those dependent upon him, that they may have, God willing, a better lot in life than he. (Applause) So, when I talk of liberty, I am thinking about a condition in which free men work out their material salvation in accordance with their conception of their own interest, subject to the common restraint imposed upon all in equal terms. For I refer to liberty, and not to license; I speak "of fire on the hearth, and not fire on the floor". I am not seeking a world of economic equality nor am I striving to find or make one in which there is no capital; if I were, I should go to China, for China has no capital, and its 400,000,000 people—local, insulated and isolated, are the common object of the world's charity. I am talking of a society state in which men are going to co-operate to produce and sustain and develop it.

I say there are three elements that must be considered. One is the use of the accumulated savings of everybody, little or big. To talk about the capitalist as a rich man is a misnomer. A capitalist is any man who has more that he needs for his immediate sustinence. (Hear, hear) I suppose the first capitalist must have been the savage who, when he was one bunch of bananas ahead of his needs, had the time to sit down and fashion a fish-hook or shape a spear, and then he had a tool or weapon—and he could not have either unless he had enough subsistence ahead to take the time to produce either. (Hear,

hear) Capital and labour produce we are told. Do they? Well, Capital, in the sense that it is accumulation over what is necessary for subsistence, takes many forms. Some are material, and some are immaterial. Does capital produce? Or, is it capital employed under direction that produces? If capital is mere money, there is a million dollars in a Toronto bank. If labour is the mere capacity to work, there are a thousand men looking for employment. Can the million dollars and the thousand men produce anything? Not until somebody employs the one to make the other fruitful under systematic direction and supervision. (Loud applause) Without the intervening capacity to manage and direct, neither one can be made helpful to the other, nor fruitful to society.

Now, when they produce, what is to happen? Are you to have permission to form monopolies of an artificial nature which shall restrain some managers from engaging in the competition of production, or which shall permit managers to suppress competition by agreements or combinations with others by which prices are lowered, for example, if you like, until a competitor is destroyed, and having been destroyed, the cost of destruction is paid by the public to the manager who now possesses the monopoly? Men may safely tolerate but two kinds of monopoly—the one with which we reward originality for invention, or that other which is built upon and lives permanently by sustained merit. (Applause) Now, monopoly, and restraint of trade, to destroy fair competition by unfair methods has been against the public policy of your people and mine always. For thirty years in the United States our legislatures, national and state, have sought to reach and punish or dissolve these anti-social combinations. But while the eye of the law-maker was fixed on this kind of monopoly, another has sprung up.

And what is that? That is the monopoly of the opportunity for employment. Now, what is the monopoly of the opportunity for employment? Well, I will ask a more distinguished man than myself to define it. Mr. Gompers, the President of the American Federation of

Labour, tells us that there is a "union shop", which it is the desire of organized labour to establish and to sustain. And what is it? "The union shop is a shop in which none but union workers are employed and in which there is a definite agreement between the employers and workers as an organized unit. In union shops non-union workers sometimes are employed, but only when union men cannot be had. Most agreements provide that when no union workers are to be had non-union workers may be employed, with the proviso that they make application for union membership within a reasonable period of time".

Let me add another equally authoritative definition. The Bridgemen's Magazine of an earlier date, the organ of the Ironworkers' Union, adds this commentary, "If the employer will not yield without coercion and the union is unable to coerce him, then unionists as well as non-unionists can obtain employment, and the combination is known as an open shop." An open shop, then, is one in which a man can be employed whether he belongs to a union or not. That is the popular phrase. I will go further. I say it is a shop in which a man is employed without arbitrary discrimination (hear, hear) as to whether he belongs to a union or not. Now, the first thing our definition confronts is a form of attack that is constantly made which is not to meet the principle itself or to say it is wrong or it is right—because upon that platform I think the gentlemen quickly get out of court. But sneeringly to remark, "We don't object to your open shop, if that is what it is, but there is no such animal. We won't discuss your principles, we question your motives". Very well, then, if the principles are safe we can lay them aside and examine the motives of their proponents.

Who first demanded arbitrary discrimination? I cannot say in your country, but I can trace very easily in the United States the first declaration made in 1903 by the Executive Committee of the American Federation of Labour, after Mr. Roosevelt's famous decision, in what is known as the "Miller" case. Miller was an employee of the Government printing office. He was dismissed from the public service because he had lost his membership in his union during some dispute between himself and the organization. Complaint was then made to President Roosevelt by the Executive Committee of the American Federation after the Civil Service Commission of the United States had returned the man to employment on the ground that the cause of discharge was not sufficient for dismissal from public employment. The Executive Committee made the point that the Goverment must recognize in public employment—or should, as a matter of public policy—that when a man lost his membership in a union of his craft he was disqualified from public service. Mr. Roosevelt made the famous answer, "I can no more discriminate in the public service between a union and a non-union man than between Protestant and Catholic, Jew and Gentile". (Applause) Whereupon the Executive Committee of the American Federation made its statement to the public, in November, 1903, "Abraham Lincoln said, 'This union cannot endure half union and half non-union, and we call upon all working men to discourage and prevent in every possible way the deteriorating influence of the open shop".

Now, obviously, in public employment there is no room for discrimination between citizens. But in private employment, what is proposed if that is to become the established form? It is a monopoly of opportunity for employment, and a monopoly that must be sustained by monopoly methods. That is, it must prevent the unorganized worker from obtaining access to the position. That means that where the number of those in an organization is comparatively small, in comparison with those who seek employment, there must be some form of coercion employed in order to protect the shop against the deteriorating competition of the non-unionist.

That may take a variety of forms. It does not mean merely physical violence although, God knows, we have had enough of that. It means in the first instance the use of collective power of organization to compel the acceptance of the condition which it undertakes to create;

and that collective power is usually exercised through the direct or sympathetic strike and the boycott. The former is a systematic cessation of employment by those who make a demand, in order to enforce it, accompanied, it always seems to me, to make the description complete, by the endeavour to dissuade others from taking the places which are vacated. Now, that dissuasion may be legal or illegal, moral or immoral, but so long as it is mere dissuasion in legal or moral terms we have no complaint to make against it. But the moment you undertake to compel men to become a party to your monopoly by any form of compulsion through endeavouring to cut off beneficial intercourse between the object of your attack and others who desire and are willing to have business relations with him, that moment you cross the deadline of social permission, and undertake to coerce another to bend his will to yours.

Now, certainly one of the most fundamental rights we possess is the right, having chosen our occupation or method of livelihood, to undertake to have dealings with others who are desirous or willing to have dealings with us. For all men live and move, be they great or small, and no matter what their position in society, by the exchange of their services or their produced commodity with somebody else. The agreement by which that exchange is effected we call a contract The right to establish and maintain the relationship we call the right of free contract. We do not get anywhere by sneering at it or saying workmen are not "economically equal" in the making of such contracts, because, gentlemen, if you reflect a moment you will perceive that condition is not peculiar to the employment relation. It is just as true between buyers and sellers of all degree, between borrowers and lenders, between landlords and tenants, between all persons in every state of life who come in contact with each other. Not alone are they not economically equal in their respective possessions but when men undertake to exchange, each wants something more than something he has got. It is not a mere matter of differing wealths. It is not a matter of comparative desire and restraint. Some men want things more intensely than others. Some want them when they want them, some are willing to pay more than others. That is true not only of material possessions but in all forms of social want and desire. Economic inequality which rests in all can only be destroyed by the destruction of liberty. By taking from somebody what he has and giving to somebody else who has not, through the power of the state. In order to create—what? A temporary equality that could not last overnight, for just as soon as the parties began to exercise their freedom in exchanging with each other the old inequalities would crop up. They would be accentuated by differences in bargaining skill and power, in character, in self-restraint; for the abstemious individual denies himself for the moment to gain a greater good he sees in the future. (Applause) That is the difference between the waster and the saver.

But we are told, "If you don't accept the shop you deny the greatest need of this hour." What is that? "Collective bargaining." If "the worker to strengthen his bargaining power must get together in groups to which each man contributes all his own strength and thus enhances the interest and power of each individual in the driving of the bargain he is thus equal to the employer. If you don't admit that, then the labour organization is worthless, for it is useless to say you believe in unions and the organization of workingmen to defend their interests, if you deny them the exercise of that collective power." Is that assertion correct? It is true the right of association is a natural and inherent right recognized by every civilized people; but it is not an absolute right nor does it dominate all other rights. What is the purpose of the organization, and what are its methods? More than that, the right of association in any individual does not override the right of every other individual. It must live with other rights. Nor is it merely an affirmative right. The right of association is not only the right to get into an organization, it is also the right to stay out of it. (Hear, hear, and loud applause)

Now, if a man is not free to keep out of an organization as well as to go into it, you have denied him the most important part of his liberty. More than that, having formed your organization, what follows? Have you obtained a license to deal with every other man collectively, whether he wants so to deal with you or not? If that be true of the labour union, why is it not true of the corporation? If you form a corporation and associate a number of men to engage in business to produce and sell a commodity, has the corporation obtained any power over every other person in the community which compels them to deal with it? On the contrary, it has only created a collective entity which has the right to engage, on proper terms in the production and sale of its commodity or service for the good of the public, and to compete for their buying power. Hear, hear) If a lawful organization produces something better than anybody else, men will seek to deal with it. Whenever the term "union man" in a community spells "efficient man" there will be the greatest competition among employers to deal with the union exclusively, for it will represent the thing they most anxiously seek to advance their own interest. (Hear, hear, and loud applause)

Furthermore, let us not forget that the abstract right to organize is not the same as the right when concretely exercised. That is one of the confusing points in this discussion. Say we form an organization of workers, does that establish an obligation on the part of every employer to deal with it? Every man has an abstract right to marry; but has he a right to marry any particular woman? Not without that lady's individual consent. (Laughter) It is the failure to recognize the difference between the abstract right to marry and the concrete exercise of the right that causes hemorrhages of type on the front page of leading journals. (Laughter)

But what is "collective bargaining?" It is a phrase of fixed meaning in the vocabulary of trade unionism. "Collective bargaining," in the trade union sense, is dealing exclusively with the union through its officers and employing only its members. "Collective bargaining" in the broader sense is any collective arrangement or dealing between an employer and employees, or between groups of employers and groups of employees.

Is the "open shop" incompatible with collective bargaining? It is incompatible with an agreement to include only the members of a given organization and to exclude all non-members. It is not incompatible with group agreements either with labour organizations or with the employees of particular plants as the unit of self-interest and production, or of groups of employers dealing with groups of employees provided that the employment is not confined to the members of the association. In other words, it is not compatible with the monopoly of the opportunity for employment; but it is compatible with any form of collective agreement without the monopoly characteristic. (Applause)

Do such things exist? Well, I can point to the Pennsylvania Railroad Company in my own country as an immediate example. It concluded an arrangement the other day with its train service men by which 55,000 of them through 378 representatives elected from the employees of the road, sat with the managers and entered upon a collective agreement; and that is but one of many similar arrangements.

In my opinion—and it is merely an opinion—from a long look at the operations of a collective agreement in the United States, corporations employing men on a large scale are everywhere experimenting with collective bargaining. They are dealing with unions; they are dealing with their own employees; they are dealing with their own employees and with unions; and to my mind social progress in the employment relation goes fastest where the field of experiment is widest. Not only that, but it has to be worked out in terms of the particular industry, and the plant. There is no such thing as a standard pink pill for each pale plant. Every plant has its own peculiaritites, every manager his own problems. Moreover the capacity of different managers to deal with individuals and groups differs just as much as the capacity of different men to make friends and hold them. (Applause) You cannot put every establishment in a Procrustean mold. Nay, more, I say on the broadest grounds of public policy it is incompatible with social progress to undertake to fit all production into one type of employment relationship. Free and varied experiment sincerely and sympathetically carried on will conduce most to practical progress in right relations between management and men in terms of their spinal task.

When the United States entered the war, the investigation of the Naval Consulting Board showed 18,654 plants in the United States capable of munition production on a large scale; of that number substantially 10 per cent. were union shops. In the great fundamental industries 1,750 establishments showed 4 per cent. of union shops. That was our industrial status as we entered. That was the condition that enabled us to be the arsenal of the allied cause in the war; and thank God, we found our part before it was too late. (Applause)

What was the experience of Great Britain? Great Britain was highly organized, especially in the metal trades and ship-building, and all the fundamental munition industries. Great Britain was no sooner in the war than Mr. Lloyd George, then Minister of Munitions, negotiated the famous Treasury agreement of May, 1915, by which the trade unions of Great Britain, through representatives, agreed that for the period of the war they would abandon their characteristic restrictions and permit the dilution of female and non-union labour. (Hear, hear) There is no more pathetic or tragic spectacle in the history of the war than the now Prime Minister of Great Britain pleading with the Federated Trade Unions on Christmas night, 1916, "For God's sake, gentlemen, keep your agreement and abandon your restrictions—to do so will make a difference of 30 per cent. to 200 per cent. in production necessary for national defence. I cannot go back to the troops and tell them that British workmen won't abandon their restrictions to keep their soil free from the foot of an alien enemy." (Applause)

There is the issue and the demonstration on the scale of nations. Now, I say that economically there must be an open shop, without arbitrary discrimination. Do not misunderstand me; I do not say there shall not be discrimination in employment, for rational selection in employent is the foundation of success, just as is discrimination in life, in the selection of everything; but I mean there shall be no arbitrary discrimination against men because of their economic faith.

I say that economically, human experience under which the producing world of Canada and the United States has grown from nothing into what it is, shows that this development has come under conditions in which men had free terms of employment. In which, under the pressure of life, they worked out their temporal salvation. "Oh, but" you tell me, finally—"you forget that production has changed; that men no longer work side by side with the manager or employer; it is no longer a handful of men under one chief; it is thousands of men engaged in various tasks of production." Yes, that is true; but you make just as great a mistake if you try to think out this problem in an extreme illustration of that kind, as if you endeavour to think it out in the lowest denominator of work. The United States Steel Corporation does not represent the conditions in which production is had in the United States, any more than three men laboring on the street corner for a small contractor represent the conditions of construction in the world.

Take your own figures in Canada and compare them with ours. 36,000 plants, employing 680,000 men with an average per plant of 19 employees. In the United States the latest census will show something like 300,000 plants engaged in industrial production, with an average employment of 25 men to the plant. It will further show that the plants in the United States employing in excess of 1,000 men are but one-third of one per cent. of the industrial establishments of the United States, and the parallel holds true of Canada. (Applause) We arrive nowhere either by using the United States Steel Corporation on one side or a contracting carpenter dealing with a union of 260,000 members on the other. Neither are typical or significant of the general or average condition.

Further, Sir, there is another consideration that may not be overlooked. All history and experience warns us that men may not be divided into employers and employees. They are human beings—(hear, hear)—and the first obligation that rests upon a manager is the obligation to know his own men (hear, hear)—to deal with his own men in justice, sympathy and understanding. (Loud applause) That is not merely the suggestion of experienced supervision, because you cannot get productive success without it. It is the counsel of human feeling and understanding in the terms of that kindly and canny Scot of the "Bonnie Brier Bush" who advised, "You have got to do your own loving." Every employer must establish his own personal contracts with his own men. The capacity to establish and sustain such relations is the crucial test of management qualification to-day, when responsible direction in competition with highly systematized and military organizations of workingmen must practically demonstrate to its own employees, that more is gained through intelligent than organized and stimulated antagonism. (Applause) Experience demonstrates that the possession of monopoly power inevitably tempts the selfish use of monopoly strength. That has been the story of every artificial monopoly created upon the management side of production and distribution. Permit business men to control, combine to restrain, suppress or destroy the freedom of competing trade and traders and the public meets contracted production lowered in quality, and raised in price by manipulated distribution. Allow any combination of firms or corporations to determine who shall enter business and upon what terms they shall make or sell and you have licensed an economic despotism. (Hear, hear)

Now, just as sure as, on the other side of the scale, you tolerate a monopoly of opportunity for employment you authorize the private issuance of a license to live. You stimulate a succession of demands predicated on the unfortunate belief that possessing the power to stop production you can ask what you please, without realizing that you cannot take out unless you put in, you cannot participate except in terms of contribution. (Applause) For that, in the long run, is Nature's own law. More than that, you find to-day that the chief resistive agents of economic adjustment are the most highly organized trades. Fortified by power they reject service as the test of deserved reward.

This condition is well illustrated by the determined and effective opposition of the Building Trade Unions of the great cities of the United States and the powerful railway unions to any wage modification, despite the now plainly demonstrated decline of the living costs upon which the present high rates were predicated. They very properly desire to participate in the benefits of price liquidation, but decline to make any contribution to the result.

The building trades organizations in particular demonstrate very clearly the inevitable result of monopoly control of opportunity for employment through agreement. The inquiry of the Lockwood Committee of New York City and of a similar body in Chicago reveals the effect upon public interest of contracts between great groups of employers and their employees, through which the latter receives an exclusive right to be employed and the former a reciprocal control of material and construction conditions. One monopoly is exchanged for the other and the public pays the cost.

This condition in one form or another exists in all the larger cities of the United States in which the closed shop is established in the building trades by joint agreement. It seems, too, to answer two suggestions for the solution of all labour troubles that steadily float upon the surface of this discussion. The first, that they can all be settled by arbitration. The second, that the vital thing is for the employer and employee to get together. The "principle" of agreement, it is said, "is of secondary importance." No sensible man can minimize the value of an appeal to reason in all forms of dispute, but the inevitable question toward which our whole discussion of to-day has been tending must then be inevitably asked. That is, what principles and what policy shall guide the arbitrator? The means of arbitration are but its mechanism as the officers of a court are but its form. Can you think of a court without a law? Can you conceive a judge without a principle of decision? It but applies to disputed questions of fact and right, the principles which exist to guide its conduct and make the theory of law which it represents effective. Whatever, therefore, may be said for conciliation, the means of arbitration are valueless until the principles of arbitration are established. Nor can it be possible that your country or mine can apply to employment relations any other guiding rule than the fundamentals of individual rights and opportunity upon which their respective institutions rest. Again we are told: "Let the representatives of employer and employee get together and put their feet under the same table, and agreement inevitably follows." But, gentlemen, has the public no interest in the terms of their contract? Are the parties to determine to their mutual satisfaction the price of their peace, without regard to the social interest? Brindell and the crooked building trade employers of the city of New York had their feet under the same table, but where were their hands? The public wants industrial peace no less than employer and employee, but it must be upon terms which follow the principles of the society in which we all live and not the unrestrained selfish interest of private groups. The American people will never pay blackmail to corporations or labor unions or any combination of the two.

Furthermore, I ask you to consider whether in your opinion you can safely standardize all employment relations. Each industry, indeed, each establishment, has its own conditions and circumstances. Quite apart from technical problems, there exists the always modifying influence of human equations in management, men and place. Enduring relations must recognize these variations of fact. No cap fits all heads. No coat fits all backs. No establishment, business or industry can be forced into a mold and conducted with individual success or to social advantage. I believe the particular not less than the general interest is served by every sincere effort to find the form of individual or collective relationship which best fits the terms of particular production. Out of such intelligent experiment must come an increasing number of common denominators, capable of flexible application to differing circumstances of production and distribution.

In conclusion, we cannot but note the contribution to this discussion from the newspapers of this morning. It seems to epitomize the whole argument against any form of organization or relationship in industry predicated upon arbitrary discrimination. Your press reports that yesterday a committee of the Federated Unions of Quebec waited upon the Dominion Minister of Labour and petitioned for separate representation in some approaching industrial conference. The despatch announces that the Minister of Labour called the attention of the petitioners to the fact that representation in such conference was allotted to the International Unions and remarked that in his opinion nothing could be "socially more dangerous" than a workmen's union which undertook to discriminate "between members and non-members upon the basis of religious creed."

Personally, I do not know the facts of the matter, but I call your attention to the important principle asserted by a Minister of Government and I ask; if it is socially dangerous to establish and operate an organization of workmen which undertakes to exclude men from opportunity for employment because they fail or refuse to accept the religious creed of the members of such organization, can it be any less dangerous to approve a union of workers which undertakes to compel the exclusion from opportunity for employment of all workers who do not embrace the economic creed of their organization?

If we can abandon for a moment our conventional view-point on the labour question and think in that field as we would of similar conduct in religious relations, what would we say if organizations of Jew or Gentile, of Catholic or Protestant, of Baptist, Presbyterian or Methodist, undertook to exclude those who rejected their creed from earning a livelihood until they did. Picture, if you will, organizations of the faithful, picketing the church or the synagogue of the nonconformist, following him to his home and urging upon both him and the members of his family the faith of the organized flock, or in their zeal going a step further and systematically endeavouring to prevent the object of their solicitude from obtaining employment or selling his wares until he had, as they sincerely believed, assured the salvation of his soul by the acceptance of their creed.

Intolerable as that may seem, a much more powerful argument could be made for the practice than for the identical measures by which conversion to the creed of organized labour is daily compelled. Through centuries of religious persecution, the head of the Church who might likewise be the head of the State, outlawed the heretic, confiscated his property and destroyed his person. It could be argued that this was of small consequence if it assured his eternal salvation, for "what doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his soul? But, sir, if enlightened society contemplates with disapproval the religious organization which, blazing a pathway of eternal salvation, declares "embrace this or ye shall not live," what shall it say of an economic organization which, fashioning a pathway of temporal salvation, seeking the comfort of the body, not the safety of the soul, declares "Follow this or ye shall not work"? (Great laughter and applause)

A cordial vote of thanks was tendered the speaker of the day.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

AN ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HON. C. J. DOHERTY, K.C., D.C.L., LL.D., MINISTER OF JUSTICE

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, March 31, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: To-day we have with us a gentleman who was one of the leaders amongst that little band of Canadians who went over to Geneva, and who was also at the Peace Conference. The Right Honourable Charles Doherty is well-known as an eminent jurist in the Province of Quebec, is well known as a member of the Superior Court of Quebec for fifteen years, but he is perhaps better known as the Minister of Justice for Canada for many years past, and is still better known in connection with his services to the Empire ever since the end of the war. (Applause) I am sure that members of the Empire Club will appreciate very much his remarks upon "The International Court of Justice."

RIGHT HON. C. J. DOHERTY

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—My first words must be words of thanks to your association and to the of-

---

Right Hon. Charles J. Doherty, K.C., D.C.L., LL.D., was one of the leaders of the Bar in Montreal, a professor of Civil and International Law in McGill University, and a Puisne Judge in Quebec He entered the House of Commons in 1908 and became Minister of Justice in 1911. He was one of the Commissioners appointed by Canada and given authority to sign treaties concluded at the Peace Conference. He was an influential member of the Special Committee of Ten to which was referred the proposals for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice.

ficers in particular for affording me this opportunity to meet you to-day and to talk for a little while upon my subject, "A Permanent Court of International Justice". Now I know you are all busy men and that you will like me to get down to the meat of this matter at once, and therefore, I think I will dispense with any further preliminary observations. If I indulge in any such I fear that my friend, Sir William Mulock here, might be called upon to object.

Well, Gentlemen, you have had Sir George Foster and you have had my friend, Mr. Rowell, talk about the League of Nations and our work at Geneva and I do not know that I can add very much to what they have told you. I shall, however, endeavour, with your kind permission, to touch upon some phases in connection with the League of Nations which they may have overlooked. I propose to speak to you about "The Permanent Court of International Justice." Of course, the great objective of the League of Nations is peace. It was born of the common aspirations of mankind under the immediate influence of the horrors of a war such as the world has never known—the aspirations of peace; and no doubt it is to realize that aspiration that the League of Nations exists.

Many have been so carried away with that aspiration for peace that they have come to look upon it as necessarily and essentially the highest desideratum for humanity. Now I for one am not able to share that feeling. Notwithstanding all that we have gone through I think it still remains true that there is one thing more precious to humanity, one thing which the hearts of men feel that they cannot do without, one thing that is more absolutely necessary than peace, and that is Justice. (Applause) More than that, I think we can safely say that without justice as its firm foundation, there is, there can be and there will be no permanent peace. Peace is a continued existence of stable justice. Realizing, if not to the full, at least in very large measure, what I have just been putting before you, the Peace Conference at Paris, when it drew up the covenant of the League of

Nations inserted a clause imposing upon the Council of that League the duty of preparing the plan for a Permanent Court of International Justice to be submitted to the nations and to be adopted by them. In making that provision the conference realized that such an organization and such an institution was, if not essential, at least highly desirable for the success of the League. They thought that without it there could be no permanent peace. Looking at it in this light I think it might be truly said that in contenting themselves with that one provision in regard to the Court of International Justice the conference expressed itself content in having made one step towards a permanent peace. It was left to the body so instituted to create and work into it that part assigned to it, because after all, to my mind, the real heart of the League is a Permanent Court of International Justice. You may build much upon the conventions by which the nations have bound themselves together to refrain from going to war, to help one another to prevent the outbreak of war. They may bind themselves to undertake to enforce these laws; they may bind themselves not to go to war and not to resort to force either military or economic to attain their ends. They may make provisions to achieve all these, and I would not depreciate their usefulness, but after all, I think it will be conceded that these results are necessarily uncertain. They are uncertain because it is impossible to foresee how far each particular nation, when the moment comes for engaging in the altruistic operation of sacrificing itself to attain the general good, will respond. The result of that responsibility is uncertain because there is in the back-ground, by no means invisible, the threat of war itself as the only method of preparing peace. Now all these undertakings are useful, but they will not attain the ultimate end unless we have a Court of International Justice. When we have a permanent and suitable jurisdiction throughout the world you will then have the essentials upon which you can depend to preserve that peace, and that is why after all, a Court of Justice is the heart of the League, and by leaving it to the Council to provide for the creating of that Court, the conference left, and I think not unwisely, to the League itself, the task of taking up that work. It is for the nations themselves to determine the rights of nations. We can go very far back and find the existence of the aspiration for the provision of a Court charged with the duty of determining the respective rights of nations in accordance with International law. But we need not go any farther back than the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 when we find that at both these conferences the question of arriving at the settlements of international disputes by means other than war was taken up and that an attempt was made to win acceptance for the decision of independent tribunals which occupied the attention of both continents. The trouble was, however, that these tribunals had no authority over their members except in immediate cases.

In 1907 the Hague Conference devoted itself to the task of securing an International Court, but it split on the rock of determining the formation of the Court, and all nations could not be represented on it. The selecting of the judges was a rather difficult matter. The institution itself consists of a number of arbitrators selected by each nation, each one selecting an equal number. But even then, after selecting their judges and after submitting their disputes to such a tribunal, there is no Permanent Court. Then again, such a tribunal is necessarily an arbitrary tribunal. There is also the question of the jurisdiction of such a tribunal. The League of Nations had to face these difficulties, so it formed a committee of International Jurists to consider the problem and forward suggestions. These judges must be men of wide repute as International Jurists or must be selected for other suitable qualifications. In order to obtain appointments, each judge must receive a majority vote both in the Council and in the Assembly of the League. The Arbitration Tribunal is liable to approach its task rather with the idea of bringing about a settlement as a compromise than with the idea of determining the respective right of nations. The establishment of an International

Court of Justice would do away with all this. As I said, in 1907 the Hague Commission devoted itself to the task and recognized the advisability of a Permanent Court, but it was unable to agree upon a method of determining the formation of the Court. Obviously all the nations could not be represented on a Permanent Court. That being so you found yourself at once met with the question of what to do with the smaller nations, the suggestion being put forward that all the nations should be on a footing of equality. The Hague Conference considered giving the Court compulsory jurisdiction of summoning any nation before it upon application of another member of the League. The Council of the League, however, favoured restricting the power of the court to dealing with cases which both nations concerned agreed to lay before it, and the League Assembly had accepted this proposal.

Well, a Committee met in the Summer of 1920 at the Hague and took up the work, I may say, where the conference of 1907 had left off. On that Conference were many of the most distinguished jurists of the day, among them a gentleman whom you all know at least by name, Mr. Elihu Root, who is one of the most distinguished citizens as well as one of the most eminent jurists of the great republic to the south of us. (Applause) These gentlemen have, I think, successfully overcome the difficulty with regard to the constitution of the court. There were tremendous difficulties in the way, but they were overcome. At all events it might be said that they had successfully solved the question of the Court's jurisdiction. Unfortunately that solution didn't come through the storm it encountered in the Assembly as to the Constitution of the Court. The Court is to be constituted by eleven judges and four assistant judges, and the number in time will be increased so that ultimately there will be fifteen judges and six assistant judges. The trouble was how each individual judge was to be selected. In the first place, only the best men are to be selected, men independent of national consideration, and there is to be no restriction except that each of the different civilizations and legal systems of the world are to be included. This is the basis upon which they are selected. Of course, only one representative will be allowed to each nation, and if more than one is nominated, a leader will be selected. As I said before, they must be all men of high moral character and fit for high judicial positions in their own countries or of wide national repute. (Applause) That is the general direction we are seeking, to have them upon that bench, and that is the class of men to be selected. These judges are to be selected by both the Council and the League, and they must be supported by a majority in both of these bodies. This, of course, gives the larger and more powerful nations greater influence in the choice of these judges, because upon the Council the larger nations are all represented and these have a vote in both bodies, while the smaller and lesser nations have expressed their willingness to adopt this situation. That, of course, is a departure from the usual method of absolute equality, but as I have said, they, the smaller nations, are apparently satisfied with this procedure. So much for the constitution of the court.

Now for the jurisdiction of the court. The great question upon which there was a divided opinion in the Assembly of the League was the question whether the Jurisdiction of the Court should be compulsory or merely voluntary. That is to say, whether one nation should be entitled to assign or summon another before that Court, or whether the Court's jurisdiction should be limited to the cases in which the parties are prepared and willing to submit. The Committee of Jurists at the Hague, however, reported in favour of compulsory jurisdiction. The Council of the League, when the report came to them, modified it so as to do away with compulsory jurisdiction, and in that shape, the matter presented itself to the Assembly. If that question had been settled by the vote, I think there is no doubt that an overwhelming majority would have voted to re-establish the suggestion of the Hague Committee, and voted, therefore, for compulsory jurisdiction. They were met, however, by the firm resistance on the part of the greater nations which didn't feel ready, at all events at the present, to subject themselves to compulsory jurisdiction. I think we will all agree, and I think the great powers ought to agree, that the suggestion by the Peace Conference is the ideal system. (Applause) You have only to give the matter a moment's thought to see that in no other way would the problem be solved, and the solution be fair to everyone. Of course, there are bound to be obstacles in the way and we must see that we don't fail to attain our purpose. You have to recognize existing conditions, and when you cannot get the whole loaf, it is wisdom to take the half loaf. (Laughter) I think that applies to the constitution of the Court as it is at present. These results of the Assembly, of course, required unanimity, because unless you get unanimity upon this important question you run the risk of defeating your object, even with compulsory jurisdiction. I think the fact that we have got a court, that we have got over that very great difficulty, speaks volumes for the untiring energy, and if I may use the word, pertinacity, of these men who strove to bring about such good results. We have now got the court and so have made a very great and substantial advance already. At the same time you have to recognize certain facts. You must understand that the great powers don't need the court for the simple reason that they are great powers; they can have their own way and can force their desires upon the smaller and weaker nations with the powers which they have in their hands. It is the smaller powers that have the greatest interest in this court, because they are not in a position to maintain their rights by the exercising of force other than their own hands. So that when you approach this question it is the great powers that have to make the sacrifice if compulsory jurisdiction is to be accepted. I don't want to state that in my judgment that is not a sacrifice that would be proper for them to make; I only point out as a matter of fact something which is to be fairly considered when you are distributing approval and blame between the lesser and the greater powers. But when we are doing so much for the lesser powers, and when they recognize, as they must, that they are the great beneficiaries, there is to my mind no very special reason why we should cover them with enconiums for standing up for that right, because after all, it is to their interest just as much as, or even more, than it is to that of the greater powers. But when we go back to the greater powers and ask them to exercise that right we are asking them to sacrifice their interests. Now, I don't want to exaggerate the importance of the great and ultimate good which will result from compulsory jurisdiction—there is no reason why I should, because we must recognize that it is going to be of inestimable benefit to mankind. There is every reason to believe and hope that this is going to be a success, but, of course, that success chiefly lies in the hands of the greater powers. It is something which should commend itself to the judgment of humanity, and if we think that it can be brought about and that condition can be maintained, you will have gone a long way towards establishing a permanent peace. Who doesn't want a permanent peace? Once you have a Permanent Court of International Justice you will have the public opinion of the entire world that we are exercising, if we may flatter ourselves, an irresistible pressure upon those who are standing out against the acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction.

I think we may congratulate ourselves on what has been done towards the establishment of that Court and upon the jurisdiction that has been conferred upon it. I have no hesitation in saying that in my mind there is no reason why it should not bring about the desired result. One or two nations were not at first in accord with our proposition, but we ultimately got them to see that it was the only way in which there was the remotest chance of gaining a permanent peace; and finally it was agreed that they should have the privilege of inserting for themselves a declaration; and with that protocol they accepted compulsory jurisdiction as between them and all other nations accepting compulsory jurisdiction. A large number of nations have signed the convention or protocol with that declaration in it, so that we have got a good start now towards the ultimate result.

Now, of course, I feel that time with you gentlemen is precious, but before I sit down I want to say a word or two more. We have every reason to hope, as I have endeavoured to point out, that the heart of this covenant has fairly got started, and that it will now continue to beat and do this work for the benefit of the whole body as time goes by. You might say, however, that there is still a great deal of work ahead to be done before much really will be brought about. As time goes on you will, I hope, realize that our aims and aspirations are not fruitless. I think it is as true to-day as it was away back in 1713 when a certain French Cardinal said, with regard to a similar proposition for the establishment of a court of this kind after he had heard everything said in favour of it, "Yes, yes, it is magnificent, but you are forgetting the preliminary conditions. You have forgotten that you must begin by sending a troop of missionaries to prepare the hearts and minds of the contracting people." Now, I hope that is not true to-day in the same degree that it was on that day, but I am afraid people still require a great deal of missionary work before we can get them to realize the immense boon that is being prepared for them, and to avail themselves of it for the greater good of humanity. Let us hope that they realize what it must mean to them and to future generations. It is a work in which we can all do our little or greater part. It is a work to which we all can very well, I think, turn our attention. People, after all, don't know a great deal about questions of this kind, and I doubt if they have had brought home to them anything more effective in the way of a real and lasting peace than the value of an institution of this kind to the world, not only to one nation or one country any more than another. but to all countries and nations alike and to each country among the others and to each people with the others. (Applause)

That leaves me just one word more to say. I have been talking to you about great wide world matters, and I am glad to realize that you all take an interest in these world-wide matters, but we must not forget that, after all, our first duty is here at home in Canada. It is well for us not to forget that, not merely because we live in Canada and our interest is in her progress, but because we really have at heart the advancement and the best interests of the world in general, because if Canada is going to exercise the influence which under God's providence, we all trust she will, in all these matters of world-wide interest it is essential that she should be solidly built up herself. Her material resources must be developed to a greater extent; but more than that, we should see to it that her people are welded together, that her people have a proper understanding of what they owe to her, a proper understanding of the duty that a Divine Providence has given them—of the responsibility such boundless resources impose upon them. This country should play a great part in the world's future destiny, but we shall only play that part by playing our proper part within that inner League of Nations which is known as the British Empire, whose name this Club honours itself by bearing. (Loud applause) We have each of us our share to do in the building up of this country, doing that which is best for the country, looking to the betterment first of all of our domestic League of Nations, if I may so call it, and then, to the greater and wider League of Nations.

Let me in conclusion say one word as to the method in building up a real League of Nations and in the advancement of that work. We hear it said very frequently that after all, a great success like that will depend on the English-speaking races of the world. I don't want to question the truth of that proposition, but might I suggest that that is not the most necessary thing, but after all I think there is something else that should be taken into consideration. In the first place, we ought to be more keen in realizing the success of the League of Nations. There are other nations in the world, and these nations—some of them at any rate—wield a great power in contributing to the success or failure of a Permanent Peace. There must be complete harmony among the different nations. There must be a complete understanding. Without these two essentials a permanent peace is an impossibility. While other nations, other smaller nations, look to the British Empire for support, they must do their own share. Let me say that we should be very much mistaken if we did not recognize that other nations have a great deal to give to us. Anyone who has had the privilege of taking part in the meeting of the Assembly and taking some little part, at all events, in the conference in connection with peace, could not but be impressed with the great trust and confidence, which, let us say, the people of France repose in us. Speaking generally, the people of the Latin Races—and I am sure my colleagues will bear me out in this—displayed a warmth of disinterested devotion that was a source of the greatest gratification to us—these men that represented their respective countries at Geneva; that was the most hopeful sign of many hopeful signs that we saw there. Let me say that I and my colleagues have every reason to believe that by the co-operation of the other great nations of the world a permanent and lasting peace will be found in a Permanent Court of International Justice. (Loud applause)

HON. N. W. ROWELL

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I have been asked to move a vote of thanks to Mr. Doherty for his very illuminating and impressive review of the new Permanent Court of International Justice. In doing so, I simply want to pay tribute to the part which Mr. Doherty himself has taken in the work we have before us. He mentioned that the Council of the League of Nations had named a Commission of Jurists of International repute to meet at the Hague to form the scheme. When the scheme came before the Committee it named a commission of ten to pass in review the work of the Council at the Hague. Of that ten, five were five of the original Committee at the Hague, and of the other five, one was your guest to-day, Mr. Doherty. I know, not only from personal observation, but from other sources, that the other members of the Commission appreciated and valued very much the assistance that Mr. Doherty gave them. I am sure the Empire Club is honoured to-day in having him here, and I now call upon you to express your appreciation. (Loud applause)

THE OPEN SHOP; WHAT IS IT? WHY SHOULD IT PREVAIL?

AN ADDRESS BY MR. SAMUEL GOMPERS

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, April 19, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL introduced Mr. Gompers as the outstanding advocate of the rights of Labour, admittedly its greatest organizer, its safest adviser and its wisest leader.

MR. GOMPERS

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—In the course of my experience I have been asked to address myself to a subject dignified by a title. I have found any old title good enough as a vehicle to express the thoughts that are in mind and to meet the situation. I do not know whether it is necessary for me to adhere closely to the title as announced by your honored President and my friend, General Mitchell—"The Open Shop and Why it should Prevail." If I had anything to say upon that subject I should say—Why it should not prevail. (Laughter) Nor do I find it necessary to confine what I have to say to the remarks or the address made by the gentleman who addressed the Empire Club a few weeks ago, although I promise you that I shall neither avoid nor evade the subject. As a matter of fact a gentleman has spoken within the past few hours and published his utterances in this morning's papers, a gentleman of far greater im-

---

Mr. Samuel Gompers is President of the American Federtion of Labour and one of its founders. He represented that body at the Peace Conference in Paris, 1918-19. For nearly fifty years he has been, in America, the outstanding advocate of the rights of Labour and, admittedly, its greatest organizer, its safest adviser, and its wisest leader.

portance and authority than the gentleman who addressed you two weeks ago. Mr. Gary, Chairman of the Finance Committee of the United States Steel Corporation, has spoken and what he has said or whatever he says at any time cannot be ignored by either men in public life, employers, financiers or labour men. I am assuming that you have already read his utterances, or will, for I am aiding in advertising the fact that he has spoken, and trust you will read them—for they deal with some fundamental issues which it is impossible at this time for me to ignore.

As your President has said, the problem of the relations between employers and workers is the problem of the time, the problem of the hour, and not only in England, not only in all continental Europe, not only in Canada and not only in the United States—not only these countries, but also in the Latin and Spanish-American republics on this hemisphere. It is the universal problem which is commanding the attention of every forward-looking man, every man who is interested vitally and immediately; it is the problem to which we must give our attention.

Let me at the outset say that if this problem is to be met and seriously considered, and an earnest and honest attempt made to meet and solve the problem of these relations and conditions, it cannot be done at all if there is to be organization of industry and concentration of capital on the one hand, and the open shop on the other. The attempt to solve a problem of this character, where human lives, human interests, human hopes, human aspirations are to be met and tried to be solved, as there are two parties to attempt the solution, must be around a table, and not in the private autocratic offices of a corporation.

When I shall reach the subject in a form that I believe meets all the legal and technical presentation of the opponents to union labour, to organized workers, I shall deal with the legalistic point of view and the fundamental principles which are involved in the issue; but even now, and in anticipation of the presentation of those thoughts to meet the legal issue, I desire to say with emphasis that there are deeper and higher principles involved than the legalistic. (Hear, hear) We may change statute laws at any time the people ordain; we can change the phraseology and meaning of certain provisions of law; but involved in this human struggle for a better life there are higher and nobler principles than the provisions of any law or the edict of any judge. Reverting to part of what Judge Gary has said in his declarations to his Board, the Finance Committee and Executive Committee of the United States Steel Corporation—for you know, Gentlemen, he has not spoken to his Board of Directors alone—he has spoken to the world—you will note if you read his statement that he speaks to his Board of Directors and to the subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation. There is no organization of human folks in the whole world so concrete as is that Corporation. It is a federation, with all the financial interests and power in a great industry. It is the greatest economic organization of a corporation extant throughout the whole world, and yet its chief spokesman has said—this all-powerful exponent of autocracy in industry, has declared in his statement—that labour organizations must be regulated in the same form as his corporation in order to avoid destruction not only of industry but of government; and he, with that wonderfully powerful combination, expects to deal with the individual workman. And I appeal to the conscience and the judgment of you gentlemen, employers of labour, men of finance and affairs in Canada, you public men—I ask you to paint to yourselves the picture of an individual worker—whether he be American, Canadian, English or an Italian or a Slav employed by that corporation—what chance there is for an individual worker in that great plant for the redress of a grievance or the attainment of a right? The mere manifestation of a desire to secure a change in the individual's condition would land him in the streets without consideration or employment. The only way that workers in modern industry can regain some of the individuality of which they have been deprived by modern industry is by collective action, collective agreement, collective representation of their own choosing in modern industry, where the toiler no longer owns the tools with which he works or anything of the material on which he gives his labour and services. Tools improved, machinery developed and the division and sub-division and specialization of industry by which the workers in modern industrial plants perform just one little infinitesimal thing thousands of times a day; the monotony of the work bringing about a state of mind in which he toils in a groove all day long and seldom thinks himself out of it. And, therefore, the worker who enters the modern industrial plant finds himself deprived of his individuality as a workman, the producer of a given whole article. I repeat, what opportunity has an individual worker, of all the workers in one great plant, to assert his individual rights? The only way in which he can have any influence or importance in determining the conditions and wages and hours of employment is by unity of action, whereby he may regain the sovereignty and individuality of which modern industry has deprived him.

There is a principle in the governments of the United States and these Provinces—and I believe that it is one of the organic principles both in the Dominion of Canada and in its Provinces, as I know that it is in the Mother Country—that any person having a case at court or elsewhere where his rights and interests are involved, or his freedom, his liberty, his life, or his property are menaced, is guaranteed the right of appearing by counsel. I pause to enquire if my premise in respect to this is right in so far as Canada and her Provinces are concerned. As there is no answer, I assume that I am right in making that statement. And now I ask you, my friends, if the rights of a citizen of Canada are menaced, and under that accusation he has the constitutional right to be heard and represented by counsel—and counsel of his own choosing—then the men and women of toil, of your country and mine, having our most vital and closest interests involved in our industrial relations with our employers, we have the right to be heard by counsel of our own choosing in the vital matters which affect the relations of our employers and ourselves. We, most of us, who have given our lives to toil and to productive service, working long hours, working for poor and low wages, working under old industrial grindstones, have not either the ability, the temerity, or the polish to present our cause to our employer or to their representatives whom they hire to meet—if they ever meet—the toilers, their employees; and we ask that in the presentation of the labour cause that the labourers should have the opportunity of choosing some one in whom they have confidence as to his integrity, as to his ability and as to his courage as well as dignity, to present the labourers' side of the labour question. (Applause)

I grant Judge Gary's legal ability. But what experience has he had in dealing with organizations of labour? What does he know of its men? I do not mean what he knows, or may think he knows, of the reports which reach him through his detective agencies or his, what the French call "Agent Provocateurs", for which hundreds of thousands of dollars are expended by that corporation and other corporations.

A few weeks ago Mr. Attabury, a wonderful gentleman, brainy and perhaps humane in every other respect than his regard for the rights of his employees, on the witness stand before the Wage Board of the railroads of the United States admitted that the expenditures of his company for police and private detective agencies is $800,000 a year—$400,000 a year, as stated by him, paid to private detective agencies to prey upon, pry upon, spy upon the men in the employ of his company. And the tremendous amount of money expended by the U. S. Steel Corporation for such service is known so far only to the most intimate officials of that Corporation. But judging from the private armies openly, and the numerous detective agencies and operators at work and exposed frequently, it is an army of which the American people and the American public and Government cannot feel proud, nor can that be taken as an authoritative source of knowledge on the part of Judge Gary or any other Gary by another name, upon which to found a dogmatic explanation of the labour union movement of America.

May I say, in view of the expenditure of large amounts of money, and of the warnings which Mr. Gary has given to the public of the American labour movement, may I not say this: That indeed the American labour movement, the Canadian labour movement, are the most constructive movements of any group of any people, in any state, in any state of life in the Dominion and in the United States. They are really the only two labour movements in any country on the face of the globe which have not their hands upon the throats of their Governments. (Applause) There must be a choice. Gentlemen, employers of labour, you must make your choice. It is really up to you rather than up to us as the representatives of the organized labour movement of Canada and of the United States. If the labour movements of our countries are to be crushed, if the heart and spirit is to be taken out of them, if our offers to meet around the table and discuss those interests which are mutual, and which may be helpful, to promote progress and to improve the industrial conditions, the commercial life of our countries—we will meet you, meet with you, and perhaps give and take, always having in mind not a catastrophe, not a revolution, but having in mind the normal and natural development of the great masses of the people of our countries from the slough of misery and poverty and despair to a higher and better life; not to overturn anything worth maintaining, but to build more strongly and firmly and progressively than ever, to have our movement founded upon this idea of making to-day a better day than yesterday, to-morrow better than to-day, and all to-morrows, each a better day than the one that has gone before—if that movement can be crushed out of existence do you think for a moment that the toilers all over Canada or the United States will submit tamely to being down-trodden and have their spirit crushed out of them? If there is any such thought, dissipate it from your minds, for the spirit of the men that have gone before is not dead in the hearts of the people of this continent. (Applause)

If our movement will fail because of the inability or the unwillingness of employers in modern industry to understand the situation and ignore and repudiate and make our work ineffective, let me say this to you gentlemen: that if I was convinced that that would be a fact or that it is a fact, I would not be President of the American Federation of Labour one moment longer than my resignation could be written. If I thought that this movement, this rational and natural movement of the toilers of our two countries, was to be ineffective to protect and promote the rights and interests of the toiling masses of our countries, I would not be a member of our Federation one minute longer than I could tear up my union card. I would, with others, try to find another way; but I have that abiding faith in the common sense, in the sense of justice and right and freedom of the people of our two countries, I have that confidence that the employers will largely prevail and dominate the thought of this representation, collective bargaining, annual or bi-annual agreements upon the fundamental conditions of service and employment—I have such an abiding faith in the great toiling masses of Canada and of the United States that they will weather this storm that is now hovering over our house, and that the labour movement will remain practically intact, and when the sunshine shall come to dispel the clouds and to bring back the sober sense of mutuality and co-operation of purpose, that there shall never be the necessity to resort to any other means of constructive organization, mediation, conciliation and, if necessary, arbitration—arbitration voluntarily entered into and its awards voluntarily abided by, and the day of our better understanding and brotherhood shall come about. (Applause)

Open shop—no one who declines to fool himself believes in the open shop. (Laughter) What the advocates of the so-called open shop mean is the shop closed to union membership. I know that there have been quite a number of specious presentations of that question as far as the open shop is concerned, but no one has persuaded himself other than at the end of that campaign he hopes to have the non-union shop, the workers rid of their slavery to their union.

Perhaps my reading of history may have been all wrong, but I have never yet been able to find any evidence that the slave-owner was very seriously engaged in an effort for the abolition of slavery. I have not yet been able to observe either in reading history or the history of contemporary times that the masters are organized for the purpose of protecting the rights and interests of their servants. And it is a strange anomaly that in this year of grace, 1921, we find so many large employers of labour spending millions of dollars to protect the rights and the liberties and the freedom and the opportunities of their employees. I do not know whether you have seen these double-paged advertisements in the Canadian newspapers. I do not recall that I have any of them sent to me by friends for my information, but these double-paged advertisements appear week after week in which the employers' associations are advertising the arguments that they are standing with sword in one hand and shield in the other to protect their workmen from the slavery and the autocracy of the unions.

Of course you know that the United States Steel Corporation declares it is an open shop concern, and you know also that the Bethlehem Steel Company has that as its slogan. Under investigations by a committee of the New York legislature it was proven, out of the mouth of its chief executive officer, Mr. Grace, upon the witness stand, where he admitted that his company as well as the U. S. Steel Corporation when they declared for the open shop meant that they would not furnish iron or steel to any building contractor in New York State or elsewhere unless this contractor excluded any union workmen from that building. That is the open shop. And it was the sort of open shop that the late Mr. Bear, at the head of the great anthracite coal company— the gentleman has passed away and probably I would not mention his attitude other than during the great miners' strike, a strike in protest against the further impoverishment and demoralization of the people there—he said that God in his infinite wisdom had constituted the employers of labour to be the trustees for the welfare of their employees, and he therefore desired no conference with the representatives of the coal miner. But justice to Mr. Bear's memory requires me to say that he lived at least long enough so that his actions stamped his former utterances as unworthy, for he sat in conference with the men of labour and brought about adjustments and improvements in the conditions of the people who worked, and their families, and brought about a better state of affairs in the coal mining industry.

But it is the Garys, the Graces, and the men occupying that same sort of position who are the Bourbons of 1921. They have not forgotten anything, because they have never learned anything. Industrially they are living in the twentieth century; mentally they are living in the fifteenth. The attitude of the master and servant, the baron and serf, that industrial and mental attitude won't do in 1921 and for the future. (Hear, hear)

I cannot but refer to another statement made by Mr. Gary as published in this morning's paper. He said that organized labour has had the temerity to undertake to elect or defeat even candidates for the Presidency of the United States. Now, what an appalling thing to do. (Laughter) No one, of course, would forsooth, intimate, much less charge, that the U. S. Steel Corporation ever undertook to influence the result of an election for the Presidency of the United States. (Laughter) The Presidency of the United States is a great public office. The President is elected by the citizenship of the United States, and I am not just sure whether we followed the example of Canada or preceded it and set the example, or whether we acted concurrently, but we have extended our citizenship until the women of the United States also help in the selection of the President of the United States. These women and these men have an equal voice, an equal opportunity for expressing their preferences for the Presidency of the United States, and for Members of Congress. There are leagues of women voters. There are organizations with a protective tariff policy, there are ministerial associations; there are some organizations calling themselves 'prohibitionists'. (Laughter) I understand that there are some citizens of the Province of Ontario who also have opinions upon that subject. (Laughter) Well now, all these specific bodies in the United States have a perfect right, in the opinion of Judge Gary, to exercise their influence to have a man in the Presidency of that Republic whom they desire and prefer, but it is a great offence against public morality and safety for the men and women of labour in the United States to attempt to influence the choice of the chief executive of our country.

We have felt the need in the American Federation of Labour for a little better system of publicity, and Mr. Gary imagines that he sees therein secrecy. It is true I am in another country than my own, I am in an English-speaking country and if the newspapers fail to even mention more of the fact of my address than that I have been here, I do hope they will carry this which I am about to say for a minute, that is: The American Federation of Labour has its chief offices in Washington, corner of 9th St. and Massachusetts Ave. I challenge Judge Gary for the selection of a committee, half to be appointed by him, half to be appointed by me, to make an investigation into the affairs of both the U. S. Steel Corporation and the American Federation of Labour. And, says this gentleman, Mr. Gary, the American labour movement has even undertaken to influence the Court. Surely no one ever would think of the U. S. Steel Corporation as having anything to do at all at any time in trying to influence the Court. I do not know their process now, and therefore cannot say definitely, but I knew the time when they bought the court. There was not any necessity for their influencing them. (Laughter) Now, the gentleman who spoke to you last spoke—and I think Judge Gary repeats or accepts the statement as his own—of the right of a workman to work or not to work. I will gladly sign my name to that and say "Amen". He says, "The right of a workman to join a union or not to join a union," and I will subscribe my name to that and say "O.K." Both follow the same thought and say that if a man has the right to join or not to join a union, to work or refuse to work, simply because he is not a member of the union, that same right applies to union men and union women, that they have the right to say, "We will work or we will not work". That is the great Anglo-Saxon idea of freedom, the right of ownership of yourself as a man, and not to be coerced, not to be compelled to give service. Involuntary servitude, compulsory labour, is neither more nor less than slavery, for there is only one great principle involved in slavery, that is, the right of the master with the power of government behind him to compel men to labour against their will and without their agreement and without their assent. It is the Anglo-Saxon's original idea of freedom, a freedom that has come from and since Magna Charta and supplemented by the Declaration of Independence of the American Colonies, written into the Charter of guaranteed freedom in the Constitution of the United States and in the common law principles enunciated by the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada. It means freedom, and freedom of such an orderly, rational character that has made up this great developed manhood and womanhood and childhood of our two neighbouring countries. (Applause)

I have said that there is a statement that I want to present to you; I have prepared it carefully and it has been written, and after it has been read I shall want, with your indulgence, about five, not longer than ten, minutes of your time, and it will take about seven or eight minutes in the reading of my reply to the principles involved as presented to you at your last meeting by the counsel of the National Association of Manufacturers. I am intending to ask my secretary, Mr. Oyster, to read it to you for a few minutes.

STATEMENT READ BY MR. OYSTER.

The premise on which the counsel of the National Association of Manufacturers predicates his statement is: (1) "That the Union is seeking to destroy in others the right of discrimination which it asserts for itself." (2) "That the Union demands the right to establish by contract the exclusion of the non-unionists". (3) "That the Union will not recognize the equal right to establish by contract the exclusion of the Unionists".

From this he concludes: "That it is the Union and not the employers whose conduct is preventing the general adoption of the 'Real Open Shop' in which Unionists and non-Unionists work side by side under such collective arrangements as may be established by mutual consent." And he alleges that bitter criticism has been directed against the decision in the Hitchman case by Labour Unions because the Supreme Court protected the Contract of employer by which the employee agreed not to become a member of the Miners' Union while in the employ of the Company.

He asserts that: (1) The decision of the U. S. Supreme Court has been misrepresented in that the decision is not intended to make Union organization impossible. (2) That the facts justify the management policy of the Hitchman Coal Company. (3) That the facts illustrate the necessity from the public view-point of sustaining the principle at issue.

Supposing for the sake of argument that the facts leading up to the dispute and strike are as set out by Mr. Emery. He urges that this conduct on the part of the Union was: (1) Not decent. (2) Not honorable. (3) Illegal.

That the action of the Company and of the Court was: (1) A protection of voluntary agreements. (2) Entered into under circumstances when no other reasonable course was possible.

Labour does not seek greater but is endeavoring to secure equal rights with employers. As a matter of fact the difference does not arise on the principle so much as it does on the method of safeguarding and enforcing this "equal right" of discrimination. When employers are strong and the workers are poorly organized and weak, the employer resorts to economic and industrial methods to enforce his will over that of the workers and thus destroys this "equal right of discrimination" by the very power he possesses. When the workers are strongly organized and the wage earners can exercise "equal power" in the enforcement of an "equal right of discrimination" then the employer looks to the State through the judiciary to effect the workers "Equal power of enforcement" and thus throw the weight of the power of the State against the workers and in behalf of the employers.

Labour protests against the power of the State being thrown against them and in behalf of the employers and is not seeking a "right or power" which is not already possessed by employers. It believes that these contests in the enforcement of equal rights should not be brought into the domain of the State but should be left to be settled by the interested parties in industrial life and thus make the right of all equal. If on the other hand it is deemed wise or best or necessary that the State should intervene then the State should accord the workers the same rights it now accords to employers. In this case the U. S. Supreme Court upholds the right of an employer to enter into a scheme and lay down a condition of employment that all who accept employment must agree as a condition of employment not to join a Labour Union and that to join a Labour Union and still remain in the employ of the Company constitutes a breach of this contract and any lawful act of anyone to influence or interfere with this contract is illegal and subject to punishment. And the Courts in this case as in many others, have held these contracts are enforceable at law.

On the other hand where a Union undertakes to enforce a contract for the exclusive employment of Union men such as the Danbury Hatters case and others (the exact reverse from the Hitchman case) the courts have held and do hold either: (1) That such a contract is a monopoly or tends to a monopoly, and is therefore void and illegal. (2) That such an agreement discriminates against non-union men and is illegal and void.

Then again, in the enforcement of these discriminatory agreements, the courts have held: (1) That the demand of the employer of the worker not to join a Labour Union while in his employ is legal and enforcible in law, while an agreement of a Union with an employer to employ only Union men is not enforceable in law, thus aiding the employer in his discriminatory contract while denying the workers the same aid and assistance. (2) If an individual or several persons interfere with such discriminatory contracts of employes as in the Hitchman Case, the courts have held the acts of such workers illegal and as constituting unlawful means of unlawful combinations while in the instance of an employer or employers whether violating or attempting to, or actually interfering with agreements made with Unions "only to employ Union men" the workers are left without legal redress and the employers or associations of employers who interfere with these "discriminatory agreements on the part of the Unions" are not held responsible and subject to punishment under the law.

It is therefore clearly evident that the workers do not seek greater rights but find fault with the Courts in that they recognize that discriminatory agreements "excluding Union men" are legal and enforceable at law and punish anyone who interferes, while they hold agreements on the part of Unions for the "excluding of non-Union men" illegal and void or if they do no go that far they do hold such agreements unenforceable in law and any employer or combination of employers may do almost anything to interfere and cause violation of such agreements.

The foregoing clearly proves that the statement of labour's opponents that the criticism of labour unions against the U. S. Supreme Court's decision: "that it is intended to prevent union organization" is not well founded, is untenable, and labour's criticism is fully justified. If all employers would agree to similar stipulations as a condition of employment it would certainly preclude the organizing of the wage-workers into Unions and the Judicial doctrine involved in the Hitchman case would stop organization and make it illegel whenever employers apply those "Individual restrictive agreements". What labour's enemies seek to disprove, every employer freely concedes, and we find in a number of Mines the so-called "individual discriminatory contracts" being used by employers for the very purpose that Mr. Emery endeavours to disclaim.

It is further alleged against us that the management policy of the Hitchman Company was justified by the facts. It is clearly evident that this Company desired to share in all the benefits of collective agreements and not share in any of the responsibilities. This company, prior to April 1, 1906, received the benefit of the joint agreement between the associated Mine Owners and Mine Workers, both in the matter of prices for coal as well as in the wages to be paid. It never failed to take whatever beneficial result might be obtained. When a difference arose it sought to profit selfishly, not in making a definite agreement with the Union as to prices or wages, but demand that the old conditions continue and that their mine operate with every other mine was closed. And then after every other Mine would again operate, this company desired to take full advantage of whatever joint agreement was ultimately entered into. In other words, this company desired to exploit and commercialize both Mine Owners and Mine Workers to its selfish advantage and sought to capitalize an industrial dispute to the injury of both mine workers and mine owners. The fact that this company had contracts to fulfil is beside the issue because the other mine owners had like obligations. And it is this sort of management policy which our enemies seek to justify, but which not alone labour but every fair employer and every Mine Owner disapproves.

Another point is that the "policy of individual agreements not to join a Union while in the employ of the company is justified from a public point of view". To maintain this view-point is equal to saying that it is the public point of view that organisations of labour are not justified and that it is proper for agreements to stipulate, as a condition of employment, that the wage earner must not join a union while at work or must first give up his job before he can join a labour union. The facts are that all fair-minded and intelligent people realize that to establish any degree of "mutuality of contract" between employers and workers to-day there must be trade union organizations to deal with our highly organized "corporations, organizations of stockholders and security holders"; that the same freedom of collective agreement and of free representation must be given the workers as is accorded "corporations, organizations of stockholders and security holders".

Under the law to make a binding contract there must be—(1) The element of mutuality. (2) An absence of duress. (3) Absence of fraud.

These conditions are held essential in the interest of freedom, justice, the pursuit of happiness and to assure equality.

To require the individual to deal as such with large corporate organizations (The Hitchman Coal Company being composed of many shareholders) is to deny the element of mutuality. To say that the individual worker can deal on a mutual basis with a large combination of wealth is absurd and a most vicious legal fiction, and the law is full of fictions based on the old concept of owner and slave—master and servant—Such individual contracts are not sound from a legal or public point of view, and only by collective agreements can mutuality of agreement be established.

Freedom from duress is held essential to a binding contract so that this very power of the strong may not be exercised over the weak. These individual discriminatory agreements contain in themselves every degree of duress which prevents the element of mutuality entering into the wage earners' agreement and instead of upholding these "individual discriminatory agreements" against joining a union and thus preventing a collective agreement they should have been declared illegal and contrary to the public interests by the Supreme Court.

The law protects the uninformed against the well-informed or against contracts induced by misrepresentation and fraud and which may lower the morals or endanger the liberties or life or limb of any of our people. On the same theory which declares contracts induced by fraud or misrepresentation, or which lower the morals , endanger life and limb, these "individual agreements "(such as were involved in the Hitchman case) should have been declared illegal because they endanger life and limb, degrade the workers and deprive the workers of their liberty to exercise their normal and natural activities, to protect and promote their rights and interests. The United States Supreme Court practically ruled that the worker has the right to join a labour Union but that where these "individual discriminatory agreements" exist that the worker must first give up his job. In other words, the Supreme Court maintains the viewpoint that if the worker wants equal rights with employers he must face starvation and be without a job. If he prefers to work then he must submit to the dictates and orders and rules and conditions set for him by employer and he must first bargain away his freedom of action. His acceptance under this threat of starvation under the conception of the Supreme Court, is a contract that contains every element of "mutuality", is free from duress, to enhance the public good, safeguard life and limb and gives to all "equal opportunities and freedom of contract". No greater social crime has ever been perpetrated upon an enlightened people.

MR. GOMPERS: May I call your attention, Mr. President and Gentlemen, to the fact that one Judge, Judge Dayton, issued the order upon which the whole proceedings of the Hitchman Coal & Coke Co's case was predicated. Then came the appeal to the Federal Court of Appeals of the United States, when that Court reversed the decision of the lower court by, I believe, an unanimous vote. Upon appeal to the United States Supreme Court the decision was handed down by a majority of the Court, but taking the decisions of the Judges in the courts in the aggregate, there were more Judges who concurred in the decision that Judge Dayton's decision was wrong and unlawful, and the majority of the Judges dealing with this case were on the side of the miners and organized labour.

We hold that there is a moral obligation among workers to join the unions of their trade or calling. I doubt that any one disputes the fact that the unions of labour have brought some light into the lives and the work of the toiling masses of our civilized countries, so that, as the largest part of this work is still before us, I maintain that inasmuch as the workers, whether organized or unorganized, are the beneficiaries of the sacrifices and the services and the duties performed by union labour, these men ought to bear part of the responsibilities and obligations of such a work.

To say that organized labour, say of the United States, represents only a small portion of the workers is not true. There are about 5,000,000 of workers organized in the unions, and whenever calculation is made by those who want to place the labour movement in a bad light, they say that means, even if you have 5,000,000, it is just 1/20th of the population of the United States. Just for a moment imagine what that means. It simply would indicate that every member in the organized labour movement of the United States is unmarried, has no family. In counting the population of the United States, 100,000,000 or 105,000,000, it is predicated upon the idea that there are about five to an adult man in the family. Well, there are 5,000,000 organized workmen, I think it is only fair to say that the poor usually have about as large families as the other fellows. So that as a matter of fact we have about 25,000,000 of the population of the United States and you must bear in mind the fact that the largest part of the people of the United States are not wage earners in the accepted sense of that term, that there are some of the trades and callings which are one hundred per cent organized of all those who are toiling in it, ninety-five per cent, ninety per cent, eighty per cent. Among the organizable, those eligible to organization in the trade labour movement, we have, I venture to assert, over seventy-five per cent. of the wage earners of the United States.

One of the things that has been held up to us in criticism of our movement is that we discourage productivity. It is not true. As a matter of fact during the war the men of Canada and the men of the United States and the women worked as it was scarcely believed to be possible that human beings would work, and with intensified productive capacities everywhere they toiled during that struggle. Was there ever any question as to the loyalty of Canadian workers, or American workers?

You know of the declaration which was made by the working people through their representatives on March 12th, 1917, three weeks before the President of the United States appeared before Congress and laid the indictment against the Imperial Government of Germany, when we declared our unalterable purpose to defend the Republic of the United States and our allied countries, come what may, from any enemy whomsoever and wheresoever they appeared. And better than all that declaration, the men of labour of both our countries made good. (Applause) We fought, all of us fought in our own best way against the political autocrat, the military autocrat, and after having made the supreme sacrifices that we made, we are not going to stand idly by to see the substitution for the political and military autocrat of an industrial autocracy. (Applause) We will work with you, Gentlemen, we will serve with you, but we are sovereign citizens of our respective countries regardless of the position in which we give service to our countries and to society. We ask no domination. We want no dictatorship, whether of industry or of the proletariat. We want progress in this hemisphere, with the opportunity still before you and before us, we want to work for the greater development of our industries, of our commerce, and, better than all of our countries, our civilization and our humanity. (Applause)

We know our rights. We believe that the declarations of both our countries—the declarations of freedom and justice and progress, that they are not meaningless generalities, but that they are the rule which we ought to enforce as part of our every day lives. To make for this great common cause of progress and humanity and freedom to develop the spirit of unity, of democracy, of uplift, and of triumph for the spirit of freedom, of righteousness and of justice—these are the fundamental principles upon which the labour movement of America stands. These are the aspirations to which the toilers of our time are looking forward and striving and struggling and sacrificing; and when they of our day shall have passed away, we shall leave to those who shall follow us in this great human struggle, to minimize its acerbities, to minimize its bitterness, to help along in that spirit of co-operation for justice and freedom, democracy and humanity, and for that and to that we consecrate our lives. (Applause)

President Mitchell conveyed to Mr. Gompers the very hearty thanks of the Empire Club for his address.

THE SPIRIT AND COHESION OF THE EMPIRE

AN ADDRESS BY SIR JOHN MARTIN HARVEY

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto,
April 28, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: *Gentlemen,*—There are many links of Empire. We who have lived through the past six or seven years know what these links are. We know that they are strong links of an immense chain which binds the different parts of the Empire together. One of the links is our common English language and our common English literature and our English drama. To-day we have to speak to us one of the greatest living exponents of English drama. (Applause) Sir Martin Harvey comes from the Old Country to us. From the centre of culture and all English drama he comes to us not as a stranger; he has been before this Empire Club on a previous occasion, and I am sure you will welcome him as the speaker of to-day.

SIR JOHN MARTIN HARVEY

My Lord, Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Empire Club,—First of all I have to thank you for giving me such a splendid and hearty welcome and I also want to thank

---

Sir John Martin Harvey was educated at King's College School, London, and studied drawing and painting at the Slade and at Heatherley's. He made his first appearance at Old Court Theatre, later joined one of Wyndham's companies, and was with Sir Henry Irving for many years. He has managed the Lyceum, Prince of Wales, Court, Royalty, and Apollo theatres. He has produced a number of Shakespear's plays with marked success and is a welcome guest to Canada because of what he is and the ideals he represents.

you for the very excellent lunch. (Laughter) That sounds very much like a shout of derision. I meant it that time, Gentlemen—(laughter)—because as I sat down for lunch with a Lord on my right, my rememberance was stirred to repeat to him a grace which I heard during the war. You know, we sometimes went pretty hungry on the other side during the war—I may say we didn't always sit down to such a splendid lunch as that of which we have just partaken. We didn't sit down to very much. With the exception of a white table-cloth an oasis of war-bread with a little margarine scraped on top of it, was coupled with a little weak tea. I may say that we were very thankful to get even the little we did get when we remembered the difficulties and dangers and privations which our men overseas were suffering, and we were glad to do our small share. This calls to my mind a grace I heard delivered by a Catholic priest, an old friend of mine; as he contemplated this vast oasis on the table he said, "Good Lord, Thou who didst multiply the loaves and fishes art surely able to do the same with fewer dishes. If they can our tummies fill 'twill be a blessed miracle." (Laughter) This seems to me something similar to the difficulty which I am in at present, as I have given no title for my address. I rather like to wait until the eleventh hour for inspiration to come from the circumstances and the surroundings, and on an occasion of this sort the grace which was just said has given me my start. Some years ago I remember being a guest at your Club in this hall, but there was not quite the same attendance as you have here to-day, but still there was a very distinguished attendance, and I was then able to tell you that we were here over in Canada to prove the possibility of an English company coming to Canada to travel from east to west and back again to the east entirely and solely on Canadian territory. (Applause) Perhaps some of you gentlemen may remember that occasion. That feat has now been accomplished, and I am very proud to tell you that we have succeeded beyond our wildest expectations. It was the idea then, seven years ago, to make an all-red route, starting from the east of Canada and going right across the continent, and then crossing down to Australia, India, Africa, and New Zealand.

That idea wasn't carried out at the time, because war intervened, but it is possible now, most distinctly, to make that all-red route, and it is a very proud privilege indeed to us that it is now possible to make the entire tour throughout the British Empire. That was not considered possible at that time as the war intervened but it is now more than possible because there is a chain of theatres stretched from one end of Canada to the other. When we go back to our old friends on the other side we are going to get as many of the best actors that we can persuade to come over (applause) and nothing but the very best talent will suffice. I may say that I have advised them very strongly to make the adventure, because in our experience during the last few months we have played right across to the coast and back again, the tour lasting for twenty-two weeks, and we have met with nothing but the most boundless hospitality on every side. We have met with the most wonderful audiences, and I think that we have been appreciated wherever we have gone. Our tour has undoubtedly been a great success, and we have played before some very critical audiences who approve nothing but the best. When I get back I am going to tell my colleagues that when they come over here, nothing but the best will do in Canada. (Applause) They must put their best leg forward, and also the best material which they can obtain, and I am sure if they do so they will have some of the best audiences in the world. Now Gentlemen, I see that I have made a start and still there is no name to my address. (Laughter)

I intend, Gentlemen, to speak on a far more serious subject. I don't flatter myself that I can say anything of the British Empire that will be of much value, but I hope that what I shall say you will consider worth listening to.

Let us come down to the root of the matter at once and ask ourselves how this Empire stands. I ventured to say in a lecture that I delivered in the early days of the war that I believed the Empire would emerge from it stronger than ever, and I am glad to say that events have proved the truth of that prediction, for history has again repeated itself. History has again repeated itself in this last attempt to smash the British Empire and she stands firmer and wider than ever before. You know, Gentlemen, there is some extraordinary tonic which the Anglo-Saxon needs to goad him to the exercise of his supreme energies, and the effort to smash him seems to give him that tonic. (Laughter) Looking back, Gentlemen, we see four separate efforts to destroy us and each one seems to have been followed by a period of expansion, and it must be a matter of very great annoyance to our enemies to face that fact. There was the effort, you remember, of Philip of Spain and his Armada, and shortly after began the colonization of India, followed by a charter which Queen Elizabeth gave to the East India Company. Then followed the great expansion of this Dominion, on which a charter was granted in 1617 to the Gentlemen Adventurers of Hudson Bay. Then followed the design of Napoleon, which came to such a disastrous end on the field of Waterloo, to be followed by vast expansion of Imperial vitality; and lastly we have seen during the last few years the dormant loyalty to our flag leaping into sudden life at the threat of the latest of our would-be-conquerors. Gentlemen, the situation is summed up by a most delicious story I heard the other day. A Tommy Atkins was philosophising on the subject. He said, "Yes, you keep on pulling the lion's tail, you go and give it a good old pull and you give it a good old tug and you give it a final twist, and while you are giving it the final twist she has a litter of pups" (laughter) and what a magnificent litter of pups, Gentlemen, from every quarter of the globe, from India, Australia, New Zealand, from Africa, from Canada, to mention only a few of the big places from which her sons flew to the help of the old mother country. Gentlemen, that day in Plymouth when the first Canadian contingent arrived was a sight which will never be forgotten. Those thirty transports which followed each other slowly and majestically across the Atlantic, escorted by British warships—that was surely the greatest and most inspiring spectacle that ever floated on the bosom of the ocean as it came to help in the defence of the Empire. Think of the great loyalty and highest gallantry which animated it.

I want to tell a story, it is a good story. It is about a certain body of frontiersmen, and serves to show the loyalty and courage which emanates from some of the old Lion's "pups". This little incident which I am going to tell you of had its inception at Moose Jaw. In the early days of the war a number of these frontiersmen offered their services to the war office, but as they were not recognized as a regular unit they were not accepted. They had done invaluable service under the leadership of Colonel Driscoll in the South African war as "Driscoll's Scouts". When they were told they were not wanted by the war office they said, "We will supply our own horses and equipment and if need be pay our own fares to England." Still their help was refused. God forgive the lack of vision of these short-sighted gentlemen in the war office. Here were some of the most able, handy and courageous men in the Empire volunteering their services and they were turned down. The frontiersmen, however, were determined to go over and they said, "Will you take us if we charter our own ship and go over to France?" The war office said, "No". Just about that time a company of the Princess Pats were passing through Moose Jaw, and the frontiersmen of course crowded around them. They got around the railway officers and persuaded them to lend them an old coach which was run into a siding. Into that they crowded, and coupled it on to the end of the train containing the Princess Pats, and pulled out of the station to the cheers of the crowd. (Applause)

By hook or by crook they eventually got to Southampton, and there they stuck. The war office would not move and neither would the frontiersmen. (Laughter) Colonel Driscoll in the meantime was working the authorities for all he was worth endeavoring to get them to recognize these men who had come such a long distance to fight for the Empire. "Here I have", he said, "800 of the finest scouts in the British Empire and they won't let them fight!" At last he succeeded in his efforts and the frontiersmen were changed into the 25th Service Battalion of Royal Fusiliers and they were sent to fight the Germans in East Africa. Many of the bravest of these brave fellows were killed in the jungles of that distant land. It is perhaps one of the cruelest and one of the least well known episodes of that far-flung front of ours. It is terrible to contemplate that these brave men lost their lives in the wilds of East Africa. The lions and tigers of that vast forest smelled the carnage from a distance and devoured numbers of these poor fellows who were so badly wounded that they could not crawl to safety. This is one of the most terribly tragic episodes and one of the least heard of chapters in the story of this wonderful empire. Perhaps you will be surprised to know that I am very proud of being honorary lieutenant of the Legion of Frontiersmen. (Applause) I was made so by Colonel Driscoll, our old chief, for some recruiting I did during the war along with two other frontiersmen in my company, Mr. McCloud and Mr. Philips.

Now Gentlemen, I just wanted to tell you this little story in order to show you how that adventurous spirit which blazed the trail across this great Dominion of Canada is not dead or even stifled, for when the Empire is in danger the same spirit animates the men of to-day as it did of old in helping to keep the Union Jack unfurled and unstained upon the farthest frontiers of the Empire. (Applause)

But, Gentlemen, we have to be vigilant, for if the great danger of invasion from without is past for the time being, other dangers and greater dangers come from within, surrounding us, and seeking to sap the foundations upon which our empire is built. It is the usefulness of a society like this Empire Club that it reminds us of these dangers in order to bring them into the light of day and to expose them. It is unquestionably the British way to allow these people rope enough with which to hang themselves. It is a sound and excellent policy if it is not allowed to lull us into a false sense of security. (Applause) There is a danger that if we do not recognize and deal with these forces which are at work they may do incalculable harm. We do not want to curtail the liberties of the people but we want to bring these forces out into the open. (Applause) Fresh air and publicity are the best means to cure the ills of the body politic. Of course, Gentlemen, there are other forces at work—forces which are healthy and natural—and such forces have need for national expression—I almost said self-determination. (Laughter) That term, between ourselves, has been so prostituted of late as to have lost its honesty. (Applause) There is a need for national expression which is an entirely different thing and is not unfavourable to society. After all, our big family has now grown up, and hard it is for the little gray Mother to see it, just as hard as it is for a father to see his son grow up and break away from him to lead his own life. It is a hard moment for all fathers to see that. But it is a harder moment for all mothers to see their daughters break away and go out into the world. It is hard indeed for the little gray Mother to see this and to know that she has lost control of her children, but she must trust now that those practices and ideals that were taught them will not be forgotten, and that they will not forget their old mother. (Applause)

Go see her sometimes, Gentlemen ,and you will be repaid very well for your time. Take your troubles to her, she has grown wise, and will take you into her bosom and do all she can for you. Remember, Gentlemen, that she is crushed under heavy burdens; and do not grudge her a ship or two. Do not break away from those ideals to which you have for so long clung tenaciously; cling to them as your forbears have done. Remember, Gentlemen, that you inherit qualities of which you ought to be and, I know, are proud. Do not forget, Gentlemen, that it was George Washington who warned those who were breaking away from the Empire at the time that they belonged to the best and bravest of the colonists. It was he who said that they were taking away with them the best blood and brains in the land.

Nothing has impressed me so much, Gentlemen,—and I have travelled considerably over this dominion of yours—nothing has impressed me so much as the fact that Canada seems always to be living in the future. It is one of the most marked characteristics that I met with. It is not yesterday, that is past; it is not to-day even, it is to-morrow for which Canada lives. I remember an incident that occurred when I was living at Edmonton some time ago. I met a man, an old Scotchman, who had come to Canada just to see the country. He wanted to see what sort of a place it was. I may say that he had a very warm spot in his heart for the country from which he came, but he was so delighted with this place and with its institutions that he sent home for his family,—he told his boys and girls to come out and settle down out here as soon as they could, which they did. I was in Regina some time ago and was touring around the city and I was shown the capital*, and do you know, Gentlemen, that the capital which they have built lies a couple of miles out of the town.! (Laughter) I enquired why the capital was so far away out of the town, and they said, "That is nothing; the capital will be in the middle of the town in a few years time." (Laughter)

Well, Gentlemen, you know that Americans will tell you that the nineteenth century belonged to the United States, but I say that the following centuries belong to Canada.

Before I sit down, Gentlemen, I should like to repeat to you a few lines I came across some time ago and which have expressed the feelings of the Americans for England. You know, Gentlemen, during the war the Germans brought out a Hymn of Hate which I don't remember and don't want to. It was soon followed by another German hymn of hate for Poland, and you may be sure that the German Hymn of Hate for England also included Canada. The piece which I am going to recite to you is entitled

---

*Parliament Buildings.

A CHANT OF LOVE FOR ENGLAND

"A song of hate is a song of hell;
"Some there be that sing it well.
"Let them sing it loud and long,
"We lift our hearts in a loftier song:
"We lift our hearts to Heaven above,
"Singing the glory of her we love.—
ENGLAND!

"Glory of thought and glory of deed,
"Glory of Hampden and Runnymede;
"Glory of ships that sought for goals,
"Glory of swords and glory of souls!
"Glory of songs mounting as birds,
"Glory immortal of magical words;
"Glory of Milton, glory of Nelson,
"Tragical glory of Gordon and Scott;
"Glory of Shelley, glory of Sidney,
"Glory transcendant that perishes not,—
"Her's is the story, her's be the glory,
ENGLAND!

"Shatter her beauteous breast ye may;
"The Spirit of England none can slay!
"Dash the bomb on the dome of Paul's,—
"Deem ye the fame of the Admiral falls?
"Pry the stone from the chancel floor,—
"Dream ye that Shakespeare shall live no more?
"Where is the giant shot that kills
"Wordsworth walking the old green hills?
"Trample the red rose on the ground,—
"Keats is Beauty while earth spins round!
"Bind her, grind her, burn her with fire,
"Cast her ashes into the sea,—
"She shall escape, she shall aspire,
"She shall arise to make men free;
"She shall arise in a sacred scorn,
"Lighting the lives that are yet unborn;
"Spiritual supernal, splendor eternal,
ENGLAND!

—Helen Gray Cone.

(At the conclusion of the above recitation Sir Martin Harvey was loudly applauded)

Professor M. Hutton, in proposing a vote of thanks said,—A gentleman said to me just before this lunch that we are going to have to-day one of the greatest living exponents of drama, and one of the greatest living exponents of the greatest dramatist that ever lived—Shakespeare. "Somebody has got to move a vote of thanks; I want somebody to act as a foil to Shakespeare — you will do; I think you will do best. (Laughter) You have as much Latin and Greek as Shakespeare, and as little French, and less German—you will do best." I am glad to move a hearty vote of thanks to Sir Martin Harvey for his amusing, instructive and eloquent address. (Loud applause)

BRITISH INDUSTRY: ANGLO-CANADIAN AND EMPIRE TRADE

AN ADDRESS BY MR. F. W. FIELD, TRADE COMMISSIONER TO H. M. GOVERNMENT

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, May 5, 1921

MR. E. A. WILKINSON, Vice-President, who presided on this occasion, said,—Our Guest to-day scarcely needs an introduction to this Club or indeed to any business man in Canada. Mr. Field is, as you know, the British Trade Commissioner in this Province and has been doing excellent work during his term of office—He is probably better posted than any man—certainly than most men in this country—as to Trade conditions both here and across the water. He has recently returned from an extended trip in Great Britain and has been in a position to study, at first hand, conditions over there. I have very much pleasure in introducing Mr. Field, who will speak to us on the subject of "British Industry; Anglo-Canadian and Empire Trade." (Applause)

MR. FIELD

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I feel a great deal of gratification in speaking to the members of the Empire Club—a club with such a splendid reputation and with

---

Mr. F. W. Field is British Trade Commissioner in Ontario. Before his appointment to his present position he was the Imperial Trade Correspondent in Ontario. He is a member of the Canadian Mining Institute and the Toronto Board of Trade, and has a comprehensive knowledge of the state of industry and trade in Great Britain and, generally, throughout the Empire.

such excellent aims. I may say that I feel quite at home here—just like a chat with old friends. I am glad that the British Government has allowed me to stay here a few weeks longer.

In taking my subject, "British Industry; Anglo-Canadian and Empire Trade" you will see that it is a rather long title, so if I digress at any point I think I may be fairly covered by the title. I propose to say a few words about the position of the industrial conditions in England and the trade relations between Canada and the Old Land, and also a few words about the development between the foreign units of the Empire. I asked a distinguished member of this Club how long I should be allowed in delivering my address and he said, "Make it as long as the skirts you see along Yonge Street, long enough to cover the subject and short enough to be interesting. (Laughter)

Well, Gentlemen, I have just returned from a visit to the United Kingdom, and while over there I visited England, Scotland and Wales. I didn't visit Ireland—they don't seem to have any great love for Government officials at present. During my stay in the old country I visited over forty plants, had a number of talks and a great many meetings with industrial and commercial organizations, and was interviewed by 528 manufacturing and merchant firms in regard to trade opportunities in Canada, and in Ontario particularly. During that visit I went to almost all the important industrial centres, including Glasgow, Edinburgh, Birmingham, Coventry, Leicester, Nottingham, Leeds and other places, and I also spent two months in London. But before proceeding to discuss briefly the conditions in the United Kingdom I would like to say a few words about the functions of a British Trade Commissioner. There has been a good deal of misunderstanding about our functions in this country, and I believe it is a good thing to remove misunderstandings. This reminds me of Tommy Jones at the front. He wrote home to his mother saying, "Dear Mother, I am a defaulter, and have got C.B." His mother wrote back saying, "Dear Tom, I am glad to hear of your promotion and decoration; be kind to the boys under you, and remember that you were a private once yourself." (Laughter)

Now, as to the British Government's Overseas Trade Departments; we have forty or so Trade Commissioners in the various parts of the Empire, including two in India, two in South Africa, two in Australia, one in New Zealand and several in Canada. Our Trade Commission service in Great Britain works in connection with the Consular services, and covers foreign imports in the Empire.

In the constitution of our Department overseas, in the personnel of that Department, we have different sections which are recruited from the Civil Service. The trade section is adequately divided and covers practically every industry. We have now iron sections, a steel section, a textile section, a mechanical section, a motor vehicle section, etc. So that whatever inquiries come into the office from any part of the world through the consular services or the Trade Commissioner services, it finds its way into that particular branch for which it is intended. We have in Canada three British Trade Commissioners—one in Montreal, one in Toronto and one in Winnipeg; and it is their function to promote Canadian import trade from the Old Country and to build up a greater inter-Empire trade.

In my trip throughout the United Kingdom I found that manufacturers had great confidence in Canadian manufacturers and in the future of Canadian trade. The establishment of our service, while primarily in the interests of the United Kingdom manufacturers, is among the first practical steps to link the Empire commercially. It is a matter of great interest to see how all the junior officers are trained in the English and foreign markets in connection with the various trades. It was decided to send juniors to every Trade Commissioner's office to be a general assistant. After they have served for three years in that office they report to London, and then they are sent out to another market, India, Australia, as the case may be. In the course of time they have acquired a first-class, or rather first-hand, knowledge of the various markets and the requirements of the various markets. I have in my office a very energetic young fellow who will be with me for three years, and then he will prepare to report to London and be sent out for a period to another market and become in time junior Trade Commissioner, and finally he will be promoted to the highest honours in the service. In that way we are training men who will do very valuable work in any part of the world to which they may be assigned.

Now as to the industrial situation of the United Kingdom. Many of the problems which the British manufacturers have to face to-day are, first, unsettled conditions in Europe, the world-wide lack of demand for goods, the exchange situation, labour troubles and cancellation of orders by buyers in the various markets.

In regard to European conditions we must realize, as Stells Maitland said here a few weeks ago, that the American continent cannot stand aloof in the belief that what happens in Europe is of no consequence here. English-speaking countries are bound sentimentally, commercially, and financially, and I believe that in their cooperation is probably one of the best hopes for the speedy solution of European troubles. As to the lack of demand, aside from exchange, my belief is that a more normal demand is unlikely until, among other things, all the artificial props of the industrial situation are removed, production costs reduced, and the relations between manufacturers and labour have become more harmonious, and we have arrived at the belief that prices are as low as they are going to be. Until these disturbing factors are removed, the demand for merchandise is unlikely to improve. In England I found the same trouble existing there as apparently exists here. Until we go to the root of the price factor it is not likely that the demand for any kind of goods will come back again until we remove all these artificial considerations and props to business. There is no time at present to discuss the exchange situation. It is a very important subject, and is much misunderstood. It reminds me of another story of misunderstanding. An elderly Shakespearean lover once said to an elderly lady, "Have you read Shakespeare's As you like it?" She replied, "No, but I have red flannel where I need it". (Laughter) That was a case of misunderstanding which the old gentleman found great difficulty in removing.

In regard to the labour situation in the United Kingdom, judging from the press reports which are cabled over here, one might imagine sometimes that the old country is in a terrible state of chaos. I really don't think that is so. The situation has been and still is somewhat critical, but it is gradually righting itself. Conditions are certainly unsettled, but I think we are very apt to take an exaggerated view of things in general. I am optimistic enough to hope that before very long we shall have weathered the storm and once more sail in comparatively smooth waters. After discussing the situation with hundreds of manufacturers and talking with a great many factory hands and the men on the street it is my belief that whatever happens, moderate opinion will triumph, and the extremists will not prevail in any walk of life in the Old Country—a country famous for its liberty, enterprise, tact and compromise. Here is an illustration of the change that is taking place in the labour outlook in the past year, and it is rather typical of the situation as it exists in the United Kingdom to-day. About six months ago a hosiery manufacturer received an order in Leicester for several hundred pairs of socks. The acceptance of this order depended on the manufacturer being able to reduce wages; there was to be a slight wage cut—every three workers were to receive two cents less per dozen pairs; it was to be divided so that one worker would take one cent less per dozen pairs; two workers one-half cent each less per dozen pairs. This order had to be refused because the operators refused to accept the wage reduction.

Six months later a similar condition arose. A boot manufacturer had receiver on order for 250,000 pairs of rough boots required by a European country. These boots were not as good as the average made at this manufacturing house; they were very rough, and in order to accept the contract and make a small profit on the order, it was necessary to see that wages were reduced about three and a half cents less per pair of boots. The manufacturer called his men together and explained the circumstances to them, telling them that in order to accept the order and to make a small profit he would have to reduce the wages. The men, after some considerable discussion, finally agreed to accept the wages and the order was executed, otherwise the factory would have to be closed. (Applause) Again, the other week the men employed in the British shipyards volunteered to accept less wages in order to keep the yards running and to prevent the work going to foreign yards. (Applause)

I have found the attitude of British manufacturers very reasonable indeed, far more reasonable than I had expected to be the case. They don't expect or desire pre-war wages or pre-war labour conditions to return, but they do anticipate lower wages, and they expect a full day's work for a full day's pay. After all, Gentlemen, in order to get down to normal conditions we must keep in mind that old adage, whether it is applied to labour or capital, that a man must work before he can eat. (Applause)

In regard to welfare work in British factories, I found that a great number have canteens and splendid entertainment rooms, and it is not an uncommon thing for the workers to go out for a warm cup of tea at eleven o'clock in the morning. In discussing the labour question with a number of various factory hands I find that they don't seem to have the faculty to understand any logical argument in regard to labour and capital. I think that in order to help to solve these problems between capital and labour it would be a good thing to educate the navvy's son, or the bricklayer's son, or the carpenter's son in a good working knowledge of economics, so that when the boy grows up and comes to work in the factory it would be much easier for both parties to get together, because of a better understanding of these labour problems.

Now, as to the cancellation of orders, this is one of the things I hesitate to mention, but we must look things squarely in the face. I have often been told while in London, that when some of us Canadians go over there it is with a bottle of wine under our belts and everything in the garden looking lovely, and when the Englishman comes to Canada the same thing happens. But I am afraid it is not a question of a bottle of wine; it is a question of cancellations of orders. This is a matter which you will be glad to hear something about, as I know it will interest a great many of you here to-day. You know, British manufacturers have received a large volume of cancelled orders from buyers in various markets, including Canada. Many of these cancellations have been entirely unjustifiable, and the results to the overseas manufacturers have been serious. Large quantities of stuff made to order are held up in the manufacturers' warehouse and entailing serious loss. This is a very serious matter indeed, for British manufacturers have to meet their obligations. In one warehouse alone I saw three hundred thousand dollars worth of woollen piece goods that were cancelled. In Nottingham a number of lace makers had received cancellations from various markets. Of course that meant that a great number of employees were thrown out of work. I think most manufacturers are willing to make a reasonable compromise with the various buyers. There are cases, no doubt, where delivery has been made, or the goods have been faulty, which may, of course, be considered a quite legitimate reason for the cancellation of that order. Many concellations, however, are simply because buyers had caught a falling market and they tried to place the responsibility on other shoulders. In a rising market previously, buyers had insisted on goods at contract prices. I believe that all the members of the Empire Club who are in business or otherwise will agree that upon the respect shown to the validity of contracts both by buyers and sellers, largely depends the credit and commercial stability of that country. (Applause) I was told by many British manufacturers that these Canadian buyers who had observed their contracts and who had stated their case plainly to the British manufacturer in regard to a falling market will have no reason to complain of their treatment by British manufacturers either at present or in the future. There is no desire of the British manufacturers to take advantage of a falling market. He has certain obligations to meet, and the Canadian buyer will receive the very best treatment from him so far as falling markets are concerned. These, briefly, are a few of the outstanding and troublesome features in the industrial situation today.

Dealing with some of the favorable factors, there is much ground for confidence. We have in the United Kingdom a nation of manufacturers who have had long experience of trading in the world's markets. We on this continent are sometimes inclined to think that they are "slow old sticks" over there, but when we get to know them a little better, we find that they are not quite so slow as they seem to be. The war gave a great impetus to the modernizing of factories, and in consequence we find that a great many factories in the majority of trades, are up to date in every way, with new equipment and first-class condition and splendid office systems. Labour-saving machinery is adopted extensively, and much improved. Many of the changes which I saw were quite equal to the best American factory systems, indeed I found a great many of these American labour-saving machines being taken to pieces by British mechanics, who had made considerable improvements on them.

The industrial laboratories are much more in use than before the war. Goods are tested at various stages of manufacture, and this has an excellent effect upon the quality of output. Much of the raw material which comes in is put through certain processes, and very often tested four or five times before it comes out as a finished article. The importance of the chemist in industrial life is fully realized, and the effect is very noticeable in various industries. Take the dye industry, as one example. Before the war all the dye plants in England were only turning out one thousands tons a year. To-day one large dye company alone has an output of twenty thousands tons a year. (Applause) Two other factors helping to bring British manufactures back into the world's markets are, the excellent quality of British goods and the excellent quality of British business methods. At the end of four years of war, Britain, you know, was prepared for a war of almost any period or length. All its mighty resources were thrown into the great war machine and even yet it has not been possible to dismantle that machine which played such a great part in the tremendous war and get it back into peaceful pursuits. One sees even now many reminders of that huge machine, such as tons of equipment, great quantities of ammunition, and the various paraphernalia of war. It is to be hoped that before very long all these things will be absorbed in more peaceful occupations. Despite all these drawbacks, my principal impression in leaving the United Kingdom is that it is rapidly approaching a position of conducting export trade again. Given better conditions, the United Kingdom will again assume its important role in the world's markets, as in the past, and will be able to meet foreign competitors.

The recent business depression is helping to bring about readjustment necessary for the revival of trade. As to trade between Great Britain and Canada, much progress has been made by Canadian manufacturers. By all means buy "Made in Canada" goods, but what you cannot buy here, buy in the United Kingdom or any other part of the Empire where possible. (Applause) Canadian manufacturers should do that instead of dealing with foreign markets. Where Canadian manufacturers are making finished articles the British manufacturer can often supply parts. Last year I was conferring with a Toronto manufacturer who buys certain articles every year—from seventy-five thousand dollars to one hundred thousand dollars worth, from the United States. He called me up one day and asked me to go to his factory. I was over there at eight o'clock the next morning and spent an hour going through his plant, taking out the stuff bought in foreign markets. I had a talk with him, and as a result we hope to switch from seventy-five thousand to one hundred thousand dollars' worth of his buying per annum from a foreign country to the United Kingdom.

I found that British manufacturers want to do business with Canada direct, and not through foreign markets, and Canadian buyers also want to do the same thing. This matter came before the British Government's D.O.T. and they are doing everything possible to encourage this direct business. I also conferred with many British manufacturers who propose to build branch plants in Canada. When I was in London I was misquoted in a cable despatch to Canadian papers which said that I didn't recommend branch plants here for British firms. That was quite incorrect. While many British firms will find it the best policy to manufacture in the United Kingdom and export from there, there are others who will find that the only way to secure business here is to build a plant here, and they were so advised.

Despite all the present economic ailments, the heart of the Empire is sound. There is a strong feeling overseas in its future, and the greatest affection and admiration for Canada. This quiet confidence is typified by a story which I heard of a British sailor. A very arrogant German sailor belonging to one of the war ships of the German fleet which surrendered to the British navy was standing alongside a British Jack-Tar. Every now and again the German would spit into the sea, saying, "That for Admiral Beatty"—spit—"That for your British Navy"—spit—"That for your British Empire"—spit. The British sailor looked at him for a minute and then said, "Look here, you can say what you like about Admiral Beatty or the British Navy or the British Empire, but take care whose ocean you are spitting into" (Laughter)

In conclusion, Gentlemen, I think that a great volume of inter-Empire trade can be built up if each part of the Empire will learn what the other parts can do and supply. Probably you have heard of the story of the American who said to the Britisher, "With a little American pep, hustle and get-together stuff, this British Empire of yours would be the greatest proposition in the world;" to which the Britisher replied "I quite agree with all you say, except that the British Empire *is* the greatest proposition in the world." (Loud applause)

Mr. S. R. Parsons in moving a vote of thanks said,—In expressing our appreciation of Mr. Field's splendid address I am sure you will all agree that it is quite in accordance with our views of trade in Canada. As a manufacturer, and knowing something of the conditions of manufacturing in Canada, I may say that what Mr. Field has said this afternoon is quite in line with our views. We agree with him in his statement of "Made in Canada goods", that outside of what we can manufacture in Canada we should give preference to the British Empire. I am sure that I voice your sentiments when I say that our love for the British Empire was never so strong in Canada as it is to-day. While we have had many men representing Great Britain who have given us a picture of conditions in the Old Country and of its service and aspirations commercially, we have never had a picture so clearly presented and so definitely placed before us as that given by Mr. Field. (Applause)

I would just like to say a word with reference to cancellations. A friend of mine residing in the United States told me one day that he had ordered a line of goods before the armistice, which afterwards he found he could not use, and it would cost him thirty thousand dollars to get relieved of the contract. He was a very straightforward man, and he realized the position that he had placed the manufacturer in to whom he had given the order, and he told him that rather than fall down on his contract he would gladly pay the thirty thousand dollars, and not have the goods which he couldn't use. (Applause)

I have very great pleasure in proposing a hearty vote of thanks to Mr. Field for his very interesting and illuminating address. (Loud applause)

THE MOTHER OF PARLIAMENTS

ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HON. J. W. LOWTHER, P.C.,
EX-SPEAKER OF THE BRITISH HOUSE OF
COMMONS*

*Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto,
June* 14, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: Gentlemen, we are proud of our Canada, of her strength, her size, her influence, her ideals. We are proud of our Empire with its centre in good old England, in London. We are proud of that Mother of Parliaments, the nerve centre of the whole, its influence and the ideals which have gone out from it through all the years. To-day we are to hear from one who has lived for years at the nerve centre, and has presided over the Mother of Parliaments so many years. (Applause) In Mr. Lowther we have the outward and visible sign of those great influences and those great ideals which we have always held dear as members of the British Empire; and I have great pleasure now in calling upon him to speak to the Empire Club. (The members received their guest with hearty cheers and continued applause.)

---

*The Right Honourable J. W. Lowther is a former Speaker of the British House of Commons. During the sixteen years that he presided, he guarded the privileges and maintained the splendid traditions of the British House. He guided that body through difficult periods of transition with dignity, skill, and moderation and held the respect and confidence of all parties. It is of interest to know that, for six centuries, members of the Lowther family have been associated continually with the British House and the Public Service of England. On his return to Great Britain, Mr. Lowther was, in accordance with the usual custom, elevated to the Peerage, with the title of Viscount Ullswater. He also received the Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath as a further recognition of his public services.

RIGHT HON. J. W. LOWTHER

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I am really overwhelmed with the kindness of your reception and I am grateful to you for the manner in which, not only here in Toronto, but throughout Canada I have been welcomed by you and your compatriots. Before I arrived on your hospitable shores I was warned by a friend of mine who was well acquainted with you, and was indeed one of your fellow-citizens, that I must be silent in two languages. (Laughter) Well, I wish I could have followed his advice, but like a great deal of very good advice which is given it was impossible to follow it; for you have been so anxious to see me and hear me speak that it was not possible for me to retire into a tub and hide myself in the shade, like Diogenes of old. (Laughter) But I hope that you will not take me as a specimen of Parliamentary Speakers in the Old Country, for, truth to tell, except when I was elected to the chair, and except when I retired from the chair, I never spoke in the House of Commons for twenty-six years. I believe you come here because you want to see how a dumb man can speak. (Laughter) Well, I have been dumb, as I say, for twenty-six years; ten years when I was Deputy Speaker of the House and sixteen when I was Speaker of the House of Commons. Figuring it out roughly I find that I must have sat silent as Speaker—I leave out the Deputy Speakership altogether—for some 26,000 hours. How would a female Speaker get on? (Great Laughter) And on a rough calculation I have listened to some 60,000 Speakers; and yet I am alive to tell the tale. (Laughter) Well, I believe you have come to see what manner of a man can this be who has gone through this. Daniel in the Lion's Den was not any such person. (Laughter) However, joking apart, I believe that the magnificent reception which I have met with throughout the length and breadth of Canada has been a compliment which you have desired to pay to the Old House of Commons in the Old Country. (Applause)

As your Chairman has said, British institutions hold a very warm place in the hearts of the Empire Club of Toronto; and amongst those institutions the British House of Commons occupies a very high place. The reason is that the House of Commons is itself a microcosm of the people of the United Kingdom Its members exhibit all the best qualities of the British people, and I think they exhibit also some of their failings. The best qualities of the British people, as exhibited in the House of Commons, may be briefly summed up, I think, as being a strong love of Justice, fair play to minorities however small, (hear, hear) a keen sense of honour, and above all, an overwhelming desire and determination for a clean and pure administration. (Applause) Because you honour and esteem those qualities, because you find them in the British people, and because they are reflected in the House of Commons, which is, as I say, a microcosm of the British People, you honour the late Speaker, who was the representative of the British House of Commons.

But I have said that the House of Commons also mirrors some of the failings of the British People. This perhaps would not be the time nor the place to dwell at great length upon them; but after taking a general survey it is only right to note them in passing. Unpreparedness of view and of organization is, I think, one of our weak spots at home; I do not say it is here—I say at home. A want of logic in the illumination of the questions which from time to time crop up before us; some haphazard method of dealing with issues as they arise; and a want of thrift; these, I think, are the worst things that can be said about the British People or the British House of Commons. I will not dwell on them; I will only say that I think since I left the chair the House of Commons has taken what is properly called a "pull" at itself and has become more economical. I understand it has passed a self-denying ordinance by which it has decided not to increase its own salaries and not to provide every member with a pass over all the railways of the Kingdom. Well, I congratulate the House upon that decision, more especially as it was a decision taken independent of the views of the Government.

I suppose that amongst the worst things that the critics would say of the British people is that they are slow to move; that they do not advance very rapidly. Well, at the risk of repeating what I have said elsewhere, it seems to me that for people, just as for the individual, it is not haste which is so much required as direction. The rate per hour at which we are moving is not so important as the point of the compass to which we are moving. (Applause) In other words, there is no use in moving with rapidity towards a precipice; (laughter) and I have quoted before and will quote again, a saying of Lowell's, I think, when speaking of change:

> Change, just for change, is like them big hotels
> Where they shift plates and let you live on smells.

(Laughter)

Well, with regard to our domestic legislation, upon my word, I don't think that we are so very much behind our children—if I may be allowed to call the Dominions children of the Mother Country. I don't think we are so much behind. Mothers are always rather behind their daughters. Our daughters are inclined to be a bit faster than their mothers, but even mothers now-a-days are trying to keep up. (Great laughter) We have shortened our skirts; we show our ankles a good deal; (laughter) we have got what is practically universal suffrage. You have in one of your parliaments a lady member; we have got two. (Laughter) You have got a good-sized national debt; we have got a bigger one. (Laughter) Your state railways are in some considerable financial difficulty; so are ours. (Laughter) Your labouring population show a considerable disinclination to work; so do ours. (Laughter) You occasionally have strikes; we have plenty of them. (Laughter) You have a burden of taxes; good Heavens! we carry about three times as much as you; and as for divorce, well, you have plenty of them, and we have twice as many. So that, all together, we are not so very far behind you. (Laughter)

During the forty years that I have been a member of the House of Commons I have seen a great advance along a number of different lines. I am not going to weary you with any account of our domestic legislation, but there is one point upon which I think the greatest advance of all has taken place, so far as I can remember, and that is in the relations which have grown up recently as developed between the Mother Country and the Dominions. (Applause)

About the time that I entered Parliament, in 1883, was just about the time when John Bright uttered those famous words,—"Perish India!"—as much as to say that the policy of the country and of his party was to let India go hang; it had nothing to do with the British Empire—that the British Empire would get along very well without India as a portion of it. That was in 1883. I remember a conversation which I had with Lord Derby, the Lord Derby of that day, who had been Foreign Secretary under Mr. Disraeli's Government, and had been Colonial Secretary under Mr. Gladstone's Government; a man of sound common-sense, who never spoke without considerable reflection, who weighed his sentences and his utterances very carefully. My conversation with him must have been about the year 1886 or 1887 and he then said to me that he saw no reason why the Dominions, if they wished to cut themselves adrift from the Mother Country, should not do so; that the Mother Country was not interested in their fate and they were not interested in the fate of the Mother Country, and they had no interest in continuing the close alliance between us. Well, that was the view, the considered view, of a man occupying a great position in the country and in the government of the country.

Now, just consider the difference between that picture and this. Consider the enormous space that we have travelled from that time till the present. No man, whether he be one who has occupied high offices or not, would at the present time hold for one moment such views as either Mr. John Bright or Lord Derby held in the year 1886. (Applause) I believe that such views as those, if propounded now—and it is almost inconceivable that they should be expressed in England—would be thought to be fraught with the greatest disaster to the Empire, as well possibly as to the Dominions themselves. (Applause) It was Lord Beaconsfield, as I conceive, who started the self-realization of our own Empire and what it meant to us. It was he who first planted that into the minds of the English-speaking people throughout the world; and what he planted, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain watered and the late war has brought to its fruition. (Applause) You thus see the gradual growth; Lord Beaconsfield instilling these views into the people as a finality; Mr. Chamberlain taking it up and continuing it, raising it, strengthening it until it became a firm and strong growing tree; and then came the war, which has developed it to such an extent that it is now impossible to consider that the link which binds us should ever be broken. (Applause)

Then the numerous Colonial Conferences which began in 1887 at the time of the Golden Jubilee of Queen Victoria have done much to cement the union between the Dominions and ourselves. This was continued in 1897 with the second Colonial Conference, as it was then called, and again in 1907; and in 1911 it rose to the dignity of calling itself an Imperial Conference. Now, there it is. During the war it was continued in the shape of the Imperial War Cabinet, and as I understand—I speak only as a man in the street, for I have no authority to speak upon those matters, for I have not for a great numbers of years held any official post in the Government, and have not been in the secrets of any Government of the last twenty-six years—I understand that at the present moment the Premiers of the different Dominions are in consultation with the Cabinet at home as to whether it is not possible to continue in some shape or form the Imperial War Cabinet, which was started for temporary purposes in the middle of the great war from which we have just emerged. (Applause) Whether it would be possible to strike the word "war" out of the title and substitute the word "peace", and call it the "Imperial Peace Cabinet," or whether we can drop the words peace and war out altogether and call it the Imperial Cabinet as distinguished from the United Kingdom Cabinet, it is not for me to say, but that is one of the matters which no doubt will be considered.

I feel very strongly, however, and I hope that you feel equally with me upon this point—that it is extremely desirable that our Representative Dominion Prime Ministers, or Ministers, should be in close touch from time to time, and as frequently as possible, the more frequently the better, with the members of the Cabinet at home. (Aplause) It is only by keeping in this close touch, and able to talk matters over between themselves as soon as difficulties arise, and not waiting until difficulties have assumed large proportions, (when they are far more troublesome than when they are still in embryo or of very diminutive proportions) it is only by constant conferences and discussions and mutual interchange of ideas that the Cabinet at home and the Cabinets of the Dominions can arrive at conclusions which will enable them jointly to follow some policy and prevent their diverging along different and it may be even opposing paths.

But in all this, let me say, there are two main principles which must obtain; first, there must be, both for the United Kingdom and for the Dominions, complete autonomy. (Hear, hear) That is really the main principle which should underlie the whole matter. The other principle is that any suggested change in our relations—and I think there must be some change, for the necessity of the time has forced that upon us—must come from the Dominions themselves and not from the home government. There was a time when a considerable number of persons in the United Kingdom thought that what was called Imperial Federation was very desirable, that is to say, that we should have in London a House of Commons sitting with representatives not only of Great Britain but also of the Dominions and of India. For a time that idea—I will not say held the field—was considerably supported. On investigation I do not believe that that idea is practical, because the moment you come to allocate seats in the House of Parliament to the populations of India and the Dominions in relation to population, it will be at once observed that the representatives of India would practically flood the whole of the rest. There are also enormous difficulties of time and space. It would be very difficult indeed, I take it, for representatives of Australia to be able to attend in a House of Commons, especially with the long sessions which we now have, lasting nine months out of the year; they would not have time to get back to their constituents at all, and unless they went back and made speeches to their constituents they would not likely be returned again. (Laughter) There are practical difficulties in the way, and therefore I think that for the present, until we overcome time and space even more than we have done of late years, that idea must rest in abeyance.

I venture to think, also, that the House of Commons is not quite the place for representatives of the Dominions. The House of Commons is the place where the great struggle goes on between the parties as to who shall be the top dog. If I may venture humbly to say so, that does not concern the representatives of the Dominions or of India; that is a matter which concerns entirely the electors of the United Kingdom. But, and I throw this out as a suggestion, it might be possible that in a reformed House of Lords—a reformed House of Lords converted into something more nearly approximating the Senate with which you are familiar, which is now, and which would probably become even still more, a little more than a large representative consultative committee—room might be found, and should be found, for representatives of Dominion opinion. I observe that that is not very warmly received. (Laughter) Well, possibly you may not have so high an opinion of the House of Lords as I have. (Laughter) I assure you that the House of Lords is a body where you will find quite as illustrious people as you will in the House of Commons. In the House of Lords you will find men who have distinguished themselves in the Navy, in the

Army, in Diplomacy, in the Civil Service, in the ranks of the Professions, in Business, in the House of Commons itself. You will find men who have distinguished themselves quite as much as the big men in the House of Commons. You will find that in the House of Lords the level of the debates which take place is as high—I was going to say almost higher, though as a House of Commons man I am somewhat unwilling to yield that palm—but certainly as high as the debates which take place in the House of Commons; and there is no reason whatever why any doubt should be cast upon the ability of the House of Lords to perform extraordinarily valuable services to the State and to the Empire.

I throw that out as a suggestion for consideration; but one thing I do feel strongly, and that is that we should have the opportunity in London of consulting from time to time, and the more often the better, some representative from each of the Dominions—I will not say necessarily the Prime Minister, but some Cabinet Minister, and it would be very desirable if the Dominions could see their way to have a Minister permanently resident in London, or at all events resident there during the great part of the year, who would be in close touch with the Cabinet at home, and whom they could consult upon all matters in which the interests of the particular Dominion were concerned. (Applause)

But, however that may be, let us at all events be careful how we tinker with the old constitution.

> A thousand years is scarce to form a state;
> An hour may lay it in the dust.

Let us remember that we are all citizens of one great Empire. You are not afraid of the word Empire, for that is the name of your Club. (Applause) I have found some people in Canada who were afraid of the word Empire, and preferred to call it a Commonwealth of Nations. Well, let us call it a Commonwealth of Nations to please them; we are all members of it; we owe allegiance to one crown; we hoist one flag; and I believe that we are all imbued by one spirit. (Applause)

O'er the glad waters of the dark blue sea,
Our thoughts as boundless and our souls as free
Far as the breeze can bear the billows' foam,
Survey our Empire, and behold our home.

(Loud applause, hearty and long continued)

MR. JUSTICE RIDDELL

Gentlemen,—Your President has paid me a very high compliment indeed, in asking me to convey your thanks, with my own, to the Right Honourable speaker of to-day. Sir, it is eminently fitting that our friend should speak in Canada, he representing in no weak or improper sense the great British Empire. Nobody is afraid to speak of the British Empire, the modern British Empire. The British Empire is not an Empire in the old sense, although, thank God, it is and it is going to continue to be British. I am proud as a Canadian, I am proud as a Canadian historian, to say that it was Canada that made the modern British Empire possible. (Hear, hear) It was in Canada for the first time that it was shown to be possible that the daughter should be mistress in her own house while she was a daughter in her mother's house. When the United Empire Loyalists came across from the American Colonies in 1783, after the independence of the United States was acknowledged, they brought with them two principles—we shall not give up the old flag; we shall not sever ourselves from the rest of the British world; we shall insist upon our share of the institutions, of the glory, of the history, of the language of the British; they are in every respect ours. The other principle is equally well implied in their exodus into this land, and that is—come what may, we will govern ourselves. And it took a century from the time that Canada began to be British, in 1759, fully to work out the problems of constitutional government whereby it is shown to be possible that dependencies, so-called, can be independent in themselves. The colonies, so-called, governed themselves, but still at the same time they refused to sever their connection with the Mother Country. Here in Canada we have all the traditions and the glories of the Mother Country, and we have, most of all, her political institutions which were characterized by her House of Commons over which our friend has presided for so many years with such ability. Were it not for our free institutions, Canada would not be the country that she is.

My friend speaks about England being illogical. Logic may win a legal argument, but it will never win a cause. Of course we are not logical It is the glory of the British world, it is the glory of England, it is the glory of the daughters and sons of England, that her unwritten constitution is illogical. We are building more stately mansions on the old foundations. We are implanting and engrafting new shoots on the old stalk. We are retaining the old forms, imbuing them with the new spirit and the power; and the origin of that power is the great House of Commons of England over which our friend presided. I thank him for being here and bringing the message which he has given. Let him take home this message: he will find no stronger advocates, no more determined adherents of the British Empire than he will find in this City of Toronto and this Empire Club. (Loud applause) We are not afraid of the word Empire, so long as it is the modern, the new British Empire, which is just a little more than a hundred years old, or the new British Empire we are proud of. We are in no fear of that Empire ever going down in disaster —the greatest secular agency for good the world has ever seen, the home of liberty, the home of free speech, the land where, girt by friend or foe, a man may say the thing he will, the great British Empire of which our friend is the Standard-Bearer; and for his words to us to-day I, in your name as well as my own, convey our most hearty thanks. (Loud applause and three cheers, the audience rising.)

THE PROGRESS OF IMPERIAL PREFERENCE

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MR. BEN H. MORGAN, F.R.S.S., M.I.A.E.

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto September 1st, 1921.

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: *Gentlemen,*—This first meeting for the new season, while apparently small in numbers, is I am sure, enthusiastic with regard to the subject which is going to be presented to-day by such an eminent authority as Mr. Morgan. This subject of Imperial Preference—trade within the Empire: the binding of the Empire together by trade—is one of the things for which this Club has always stood in its history, and one of the things which now I am sure, we are all anxious to further by every means that we can. The Empire exists largely by its commercial tie, added to the patriotic Empire-loyalty tie. To-day we are to hear Mr. Morgan, who is eminently equipped to speak on this subject. At this time particularly, when our friends to the south are trying a new plan for trade within their Empire, it is particularly interesting to us that we should examine and analyze the situation in which the British Empire and particularly Canada finds itself with regard to trade, I have pleasure in calling on Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Ben. H. Morgan is Chairman of the British Empire's Producers' Association. For years he was Honorary Secretary of the Manufacturers' Association of Great Britain and a Lecturer on Colonial trade in the London School of Economics. He is a member of the Imperial Council of Commerce, and the author of a number of publications on Trade and Commerce.

MR. BEN H. MORGAN

General Mitchell and Gentlemen,—I would like in the first place to express my very great appreciation of the honour you have done me in inviting me here as your guest to-day. I feel very great diffidence in speaking to a Canadian audience on the subject of Progress of Imperial Preference, and especially to a gathering under the ægis of the Empire Club, because preference is a principle that you have espoused for many years, and you know, more or less, its ramifications all through the Empire.

Before I proceed to detail my views of the Progress of Preference I would like to give expression to a few thoughts that occur to me on the present political and economic organization of the British Empire. We are all aiming at the same thing—the development and consolidation of the Empire, and the closer union of the peoples comprising it. But there are two streams of thought and action. One is in the direction of Imperial Federation—and don't forget that that movement is a very highly organized movement in many parts of the Empire, having its own journals, and very ably conducted they are. The other school of thought is in the direction of autonomous government. In my opinion we cannot promote Empire unity by legislation; kinship, common ideals, common interests, mutual defence, a common economic policy—these, in my opinion, are the true bonds of unity. (Applause) I believe it will be found that the lines on which the Empire is developing at the present time are the right lines, and this might be expressed in the words—the ever-increasing freedom of each part in the management of its own affairs.

The great war through which we have passed, however, has disclosed both the strength and the weaknesses of autonomous government. It was one of the most inspiring episodes of the war that in the moment of danger men from the Yukon, the back-woods of Australia, the heart of Africa, dropped their tools and rallied to the flag. That spirit, in my opinion, would never have existed under Imperial Federation. On the other hand, the autonomous system of government has its weaknesses, as the war has painfully disclosed to us. These weaknesses were apparent from the very start. We had no common or understood policy of defence, with the result that our strength was dissipated in covering up disclosed weaknesses of defence all over the Empire. What proved our greatest weakness, however, was the lack of an economic policy, with the result that many of the principal key industries were, even in the hour of danger, found to be controlled by enemy countries and enemy organizations, and even the raw materials essential for the conduct of the war and for the daily life of the people were in the hands of foreign corporations. I need not refer in detail; you will all remember the position of Canadian nickel, Australian zinc, Malay copper, Indian tungsten. I had the question of tungsten in my own hands, and I knew the difficulty of getting it at a very critical time. Raw materials from East and West Africa were controlled by enemy countries. It will be seen, therefore, that if we are to continue along autonomous lines of government we must have a thoroughly understood and accepted foreign policy, a defence policy, and in particular an economic Empire policy.

It is particularly with regard to the latter that I wish to speak. I venture to say that the principle underlying any Empire policy must be one of Imperial Preference. By Imperial Preference I do not mean tariff preference; that would be a very limited view of such a policy. Preference is, as I understand it, an expression of the family tie, and covers everything pertaining to the economic and social welfare of the people of the Empire. The people of Canada are familiar with the principle in respect to tariffs, as are other parts of the Dominions; and the Mother-country has specialized in every form of preference to which I shall presently refer.

I would like to refer for a moment to the position of the Mother-country just before the war. So international in our ideas had we become that, amongst the first of the people's orders in foreign countries, was the British Empire. It is remarkable to the people of this country, and it is a difficult thing to understand, how our Foreign Office, our own War Office, could invite German and Austrian firms to supply them, in competition with British firms, with the means of defence of Great Britain. But that was actually the position that we were in just before the war. The Crown Agents for the Colonies, the great purchasing department in England, purchasing the supplies for some forty-five Crown Colonies, kept whole industrial districts in Germany busy with orders for rails, machinery and supplies for those forty-five British territories. At the out-break of the war the London County Council had orders in Germany for rails and tramway material to the extent of over half a million pounds. The Port of London authorities had orders for dock gates and machinery to the value of over half a million pounds. I want you to understand these things because these are your affairs as well as ours; if you are going to participate in the government of the Empire as you should, and to take your proper place in foreign policy and in evolving an economic policy—these are your questions as well as ours. The placing of such orders was justified on a difference in price in favour of the foreigner of from two to ten per-cent; and the great consideration, the Empire consideration, was entirely lost sight of—the fact that from thirty to sixty per-cent of the value of those contracts was lost in the service-bill of the workmen of the United Kingdom and the Dominions.

What is the position to-day? I am afraid the outlook of the Mother country in regard to these matters has not altered to the extent that it should have. The British market to-day is being flooded with Austrian, German, Swiss, Belgian and other goods. As you know, the value of the mark in Germany itself still retains its purchasing power, although its value outside of Germany is practically down to zero. There is no longer a question of industrial competition in the ordinary sense; and still these goods come in, and many of them come in labelled

"London Make" "Sheffield Make", etc. They find their way into every Dominion on preferential terms through our having no legislation compelling a marking, under heavy penalties, of the country of origin.

I am talking a great deal about the unwisdom of the Mother Country, and I am doing it advisedly, because personally I want to see the Dominions taking a larger share in dealing with these problems, and representing their views on these problems, which really affect them almost as directly as the people of the United Kingdom.

I have referred to the unfortunate limitation that has been set in the popular mind to the term, "Imperial Preference" and its consequent associations with party politics in connection with tariff construction. In my opinion tariffs are very effective means of giving a preference, and I think it is very unfortunate that Great Britain has not made more use of this expedient to encourage Empire trade; but there are other means which can be used to develop reciprocity in inter-Empire relations, namely, finance, shipping, cables and wireless, emigration, and last but not least, in domestic and social preference, to which I will refer later.

I am afraid I am trespassing on your time in my introductory remarks, but if you will permit me I will refer, in turn, to each of these factors operating in regard to the Principle of Preference.

First of all, tariffs. Preferential tariffs, have made a considerable development in the Empire since the war, and during the latter years of the war. You Canadians think you are the pioneers of Preference, and I am sorry to have to disillusionize you. The preference was first introduced into the tariff shortly after South Africa was founded, after the pioneer work had been done by Vasco de Gama. The first scale of duties in South Africa, the first scale of import duties, provided for a preference to the Mother-Country, and that preference was in respect to alcohol. (Laughter) It is a very extraordinary coincidence that the last preference that has been placed in a tariff in the Empire is one that has been incorporated in our finance, and only a few weeks ago, and that gives a preference of two shillings and six-pence per gallon to Empire alcohol—for power purposes. (Laughter) But it is really to Canada that the credit must be given for the development of tariff preference as we now understand it; and I think the Empire owes a great deal to the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier for his insisting on that principle in the first Imperial Conference.

You put your preference arrangements on very broad lines, and their advantages are open to any other part of the Empire that will reciprocate. The tariff arrangements between Canada and the West Indies, will, in my opinion, promote a connection with those tropical countries that will be absolutely invaluable. It will make Canada a self-supporting unit; you will have the products of the tropics that you can exchange with the West Indies for your manufactured and agricultural products. You have a preference in South Africa, but it is a small one; but that can be considerably developed, and I think you could get a larger preference in South Africa if you would buy in that country some of those goods that you now buy from foreign countries, but which South Africa produces pre-eminently. You could get return cargoes.

The British Empire Producers' Organization, of which I have the honour to be Chairman, has been instrumental in promoting Preferential Tariffs, inter-Empire tariffs, in many parts, and particularly between the Crown Colonies and the Dominions and the Crown Colonies and the Mother Country. I have recently taken part in discussions involving preferential tariffs between Canada and Australia, and I hope that they will come to fruition in a very short time. It will open up a new vista for Canadian trade in many avenues. But then, you know that both Australia and New Zealand have preferential arrangements with the Mother Country; they have them with South Africa, with Mauritius, with Ceylon; and so this whole principle of preference is gradually pervading the economic life of the Empire. The great weakness is the Mother Country, which should be, in my opinion, the great co-ordinator of this economic system.

A word about India. There is a commission now sitting in India to consider the advisability of incorporating preference in the Indian tariff, and the feeling in India, I know, is rather against preference. The position has been prejudiced very much by the people of Lancashire, who, when India started to enquire into this question, to take practical steps, protested very strongly against any system of preference in India, on the argument that preference implied a protective tariff. Well, I am not a bit sorry for Lancashire, now that India has turned around and imposed an additional ten per-cent duty in her tariff without any preference at all. I consider that the Lancashire people did very ill service to the Empire in opposing preference in India.

Negotiations are also on foot to bring about preferential arrangements between Newfoundland and the West Indies, and I think that is very likely to come about in the very near future.

Now, let me say something about the United Kingdom. We have made great strides since the war towards the adoption of this principle, and if we have not embraced it as a policy we are using it seriously as an expedient. Previous to the war the sugar industry of the Empire, as you know, was languishing under German and Austrian competition. The British Empire Producers' Organization put a deputation to the government and impressed upon it the serious position of the British sugar industry, with the result that British-grown sugar was given a very substantial preference in the British tariff. They have, in individual cases, made a special representation in regard to a number of other items, such as Dominion wines and various products.

Just before I left the Old Country, on July 21st, there was passed through the British House of Commons a bill called the "Safeguarding of Industries Bill". You are doubtless familiar with its provisions. It is a very great instalment of the principle of preference. The first portion of the bill empowers the government to impose duties up to 33 1/3 per-cent on any imports likely to affect key or essential industries in Great Britain. The second part authorizes the imposition of duties to compensate for adverse exchanges—and there again the Board of Trade can impose duties up to an additional 33 1/3 per-cent. Now, under both provisions of the bill the British Empire is entirely excluded, that is to say, those duties may not be imposed upon any goods coming from any part of the British Empire. (Applause) That, in my opinion, embodies a principle of the very highest value in British legislation. (Hear, hear) Another advance in political thought extending towards Imperial Preference was recorded in the proceedings of the Empire Agricultural Conference which was organized by my Organization and concluded just before I left England. For the first time the British farmer joined with Dominion and Colonial farmers in passing a resolution in favour of Imperial Preference. That is an extraordinary political development in the United Kingdom, and I mention this to show you the trend that I hope we are permanently embarked upon in the Old Country. As a result of that Conference I am at present in Canada. The Conference felt that the time had come for Canada and the Mother Country to get into direct trading relations. The United States has been the principal broker for your products; your wheat, your meat and other products have been sold to us through the United States, and I am over here discussing with agricultural and other organizations what means we can take to promote the direct marketing of Canadian goods in the United Kingdom. (Applause) It is an operation that will not only promote Empire unity and consolidation but will give actually a higher price to the Canadian producer and a lower price to the Canadian consumer (hear, hear) because the passage, the mere handling of your goods by a third party, entails something like five distinct commissions, every one of which, or most of which, could be entirely cut out in the handling of your products. So much for tariff.

May I refer to the second point—Empire finance? I have always held the view that British finance should never be divorced from British policy; that the credit of this Empire has been built up by the stability of character, the progressiveness, the deeds of heroism and sacrifice, of all the peoples composing the Empire. The seat of finance is in London, but the credit at the back of all finance belongs to you as much as it does to us. Now, how is this great instrument of finance being used? And how was it used before the war? The bulk of the capital issued in the first six months on the London market in the present year was for foreign enterprises—and this at a time when we need all our means for re-construction work and for developing our industries to enable us to bear the burden of the war.

Three weeks before the war broke out there was an Austrian loan issued in London, and it was subscribed two or three times over. At the same time there were several Dominion loans issued, particularly a New Zealand loan, about twenty or thirty per-cent of which was subscribed. That happened about three weeks before the outbreak of war. Now, just before I left London the Government of the Province of San Paolo, Brazil, issued a loan on the London market for two million pounds, the object of which was to stimulate the coffee industry there, and at that time our own coffee industry was absolutely a dead-letter. They have enormous stocks but no market; East Africa and Uganda and West Africa, and all those producers languish and die because of the need of capital to carry the industry over this period, yet they issue a loan of two million pounds on the London market to tide over the San Paolo coffee industry! Well, I contend, Gentlemen, that there is something radically wrong when that sort of thing can happen in the Empire to-day. (Hear, hear) I need not point out to you how desirable it is that that capital which is going into foreign enterprises might be directed towards the development of Canada and Canadian industries in competition with the United States. That is a subject that I am enquiring into here.

Then we come to another form of Preference, and that is in connection with shipping on railways. I would like to see the old navigation laws re-imposed on the Empire—that British goods should be carried to British ports in British bottoms. (Applause) Let a British shipper try to do some business on the American coast and see what kind of treatment he gets. Before the war we were so lacking in a shipping policy that one of our largest shipping companies in Great Britain had a secret agreement—I happen to have seen a copy of it myself—with a German shipping firm to push your Canadian Pacific Ocean Service off one of its trade routes. There was a conspiracy with the leading British shipping houses, and the foreign house, to push out another English concern, or British concern. There is no guiding principle at the back of all this; and if we had an Empire policy that was thoroughly understood and that was at the back of all our legislation and all our doings, these things could not occur.

In connection with shipping and railways there is one form of preference which we all could develop, and in my opinion it would be one of the most effective forms; that is, to establish systems of through rates and through bookings. It should be possible to get a through rate from Winnipeg to Birmingham. Before the war Germany had this through system of bookings in operation, and an exporter in the interior of Germany could send a parcel of goods to Johannesburg for one booking and at one rate, and need not employ any intermediaries. That facility could be utilized by you. You have a national system of railways; you have a merchant marine which wants something to do; you could tie them all up and you could establish very effective through bookings which would stimulate Canadian industry enormously. (Applause) The next preference is in connection with cable and wireless. I do not know what you can have thought of the Old Country for the way it has handled the question of wireless. I consider that our government has stood in the way of the development of those means of inter-communication in the most criminal manner. At the last Imperial Conference some progress was made, I believe; but we have to remove the obstruction, the influence of the old cable concern, before wireless is going to make very much headway.

Then I will just refer shortly, for I am afraid my time is entirely gone, to domestic and social preference. By social preference I mean such preference as has been entered into by Australia and New Zealand in regard to social legislation. The old-age pensioner in Australia can emigrate to New Zealand without forfeiting his old age pension, and the countries on both sides honor these obligations. I merely point to this as a new development in the way of Preference in legislation. If we could have similar legislation over all parts of the Empire we should then obliterate boundaries to a much greater extent.

Then, with regard to domestic preference let me say a word. By that I mean that all of us should in our personal lives seek to purchase only British goods—Empire goods. (Applause) In the present condition of the Empire it ought to be a religion with everyone of us, and I very heartily approve of your Made-in-Canada movement which is being pushed so well by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. (Applause) Charity begins at home. You are only strong to the Empire if you are strong in yourselves; and the first preference must always be given to local products, and after that comes the preference to Empire products.

With regard to this question of preference let me say one more word. We cannot do better than follow the example of the United States. In Cuba and the Philippines and Porto Rico, and wherever the United States has a political control, the first thing she does is to establish a preferential tariff that will effectively prevent any other country engaging in competitive trade with her own manufacturers. We had a very big business in sugar machinery with Cuba. That was killed by the forty per-cent preference in favour of United States manufacturing. The difference in tariff in favour of their manufacturers in the Philippines is still greater.

Now, you are all men of affairs, and I make no appeal to you on the grounds of sentiment alone, but on those of common-sense and patriotism. It is good to trade together; it is sound economics to devote our energies and capital to the development of our own family estate. The achievements of the British race in literature, in industry, in science, in civilizing influence throughout the world will last through all time; it needs no perpetuation. But if we as a race are still to go forward in the paths of progress, and play our proper part, we must be guided by a great common principle which will keep us free from outside domination and dependence on the goodwill of other nations. (Loud applause)

President Mitchell: Gentlemen, I am sure we have listened to Mr. Morgan with very great interest and very great profit. The constructive suggestions which he has made will appeal to all the members present. I have great pleasure, Mr. Morgan, in extending to you our very great thanks for your very excellent address to-day. (Applause)

DIFFICULTIES AND OPPORTUNITIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

ADDRESS BY REV. A. W. GOUGH, M.A., F.R.S.L.,
PREBENDARY OF ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, LONDON

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto
September 22, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL introduced the Reverend Prebendary Gough as an ardent imperialist, the pastor of one of the largest congregations in London, a high official of St. Paul's Cathedral and chairman of the Maple Leaf Fellowship.

REV. PREBENDARY GOUGH

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I have to speak to three meetings this afternoon and I do not want to go over just the same ground. I am not likely to, for I have a terrible memory; but in the train coming here I jotted down three fairly separate outlines of thought in order that, if possible, I might not trespass in case any one of you should be at Upper Canada College, or by some circuitous route get into the Ladies' Canadian Club and be fatigued by repetition.

Our subject is the "Difficulties and Opportunities of the British Empire." Well, first, I have no tendency to be pessimistic, and there is nothing pessimistic in my soul. I will say something about the difficulties. As I came along in the train it occurred to me that if an observer from Mars had alighted in Great Britain at any time since the Armistice he might have come to the opinion, if he were a hasty person like the Psalmist,—who said that all men were liars, because he was in such a hurry,—he might, I say, have come to the opinion that really it was an unfortunate thing to win a war.

We had very great troubles, as you know. They have not been singular to England; they have been elsewhere. But it has been strange that nations that have had greatest victories through their armies and in human endeavour should have had so much to plague them since victory crowned their efforts. It is singular; and yet I do not think it is difficult to explain. Certainly it is not due to the fact that we have been engaged in a great war and that we have won the war. Our troubles are not the result of our victories. Some of the troubles of course must be expected to be found in a nation, in a race, in a group of peoples that have gone through such a strain and have had to climb such heights of sacrifice. Of course there have been certain reactions, but all these are very different from all the troubles that we have been wearied by. I will tell you what I think some of our principal troubles are. One of our principal troubles has been this—that the best people in our land, the soundest people, have not been so assertive, so expressive, so united as they ought to have been. (Hear, hear) There is that dear old England—full still of such a splendid generosity of life—yet if you put your ear to the ground, or put your eye near the column of the newspaper, you might come to the opinion that it was the most distressful land, and that everybody who had anything worth saying was saying something which was uncomfortable for good people to listen to. And the real fact of the matter is that the good people undoubtedly have been rather tired by the immense expense of energy and soul during the war, but that a great many other people were not tired at all by the war. Oh, not at all. Some of them went to very comfortable places during the war (laughter) and some of them went to places from which they were able to level discomfort and distress upon the patriotic, the overwhelmingly more numerous sections of the nation. Those people were not a bit tired when the war came on. Now was their time; they had not fought; now those men were going to march forward to war and they have. Those people are full of a certain kind of enthusiasm and energy. It almost seems as if the very powers of darkness felt that their time had come when the forces of righteousness had won the great victory. Everywhere these embittered people, these people with a grudge against society, these people whose animating motives are predominately destructive, came out into the open, and unfortunately they attracted far too much attention.

I have no doubt that if this were not a patriotic gathering, and if I were to appear in a gathering, even in this warm centre of the empire—I suppose the best place in Canada for a generous constructive idea to set upon its way in good hope—yet if I were to gather together even in the city of Toronto the people who are against the Empire, and say something violently destructive, I should attract far more attention and advertisement than I wish to do by speaking among friends of Britain. (Applause)

It is a formidable fact that almost throughout the Empire the most enthusiastic expression seems to be found coming from the lips of people whose hearts are set upon destruction. You find it if you go on Sunday to Hyde Park and listen to the orators of the various groups; find where the big crowds are, find where the flung hand, the swinging arms, and the enthusiastic crowd are—there you find in most cases that those crowds and those orators have expressed something which is against the interests of humanity and against the interests of England. A terrible thing. Why won't the good people be a little less mild? (Hear, hear) Why must they take it that to be a good man means to be a dumb man and that to be a pious man means to be a man who washes his hands in invisible soap and seems constantly to be wanting to apologize to Almighty God for being such a worm? Oh, the pity of it! If we could only get the multitudinous good of Britain and of Canada to be as expressive as that sporadic mischief which is seeking to poison the Imperial life and bring down the Imperial edifice, then the difficulties of the Empire would vanish away like smoke and the glorious sun would shine over the Empire, with no clouds, but with endless visions of hope. (Loud applause)

Now, the boldness of those troublesome people in Britain at all events, at the present time, is largely due to the fact that they were not treated as they ought to have been treated during the war. They were treated too well. It is an extraordinary thing. As an old and patient plodder for well on twenty years on Universal Service, at the beginning of the war I pleaded with our government to make the situation just by imposing universal service as England wanted it to be imposed upon the whole of our people. Instead of that, you know some of the people gave themselves to the war and some of the people did not give themselves to the war, and some who did not give themselves to the war were presently got hold of by that ingenious and ever-working German propaganda and made difficulties in the industrial life.

It is my business, as Chairman of the British Workers League for London and the Home Counties, to follow the behaviour of those people with a good deal of attention, not only in London and the Home Counties, and I am entirely sure that much of the trouble that Britain has had during the war is directly due to the fact that those people became chartered libertines of mischief during the war, and under hardly any restrictions of any kind. They merely had to pop down into a coal mine or some such place, and from that safe place they were able to work mischief for the community. It is because of that wicked liberty that was given to the workers of iniquity during the war that those people rose from one height of boldness to another, and from one demand of audacity to another, until when war ended with many laurels to their credit they were able to prepare once more to hold the community to ransom. I believe that that is very largely the reason why we have difficulties in the British Empire.

But there are others. Englishmen are extremely patient people. Fortunately there is another side to that virtue which the German Kaiser used to call obstinacy (laughter); but it is only in gravely difficult situations that the indomitable, courageous obstinacy of our race is wont to assert itself. At ordinary times we are extremely good-natured. We suffer fools, and others who are worse than fools, I won't say gladly, but much too patiently; and since the war, instead of dealing with the elements of the national life and the imperial life that were most worthy of attention, we have been giving nearly all our time to dealing with the people who are making trouble. It is most extraordinary. Wherever people did not do anything much to help the war, they first started to make exorbitant demands as soon as the war was over, and our authorities were largely occupied in trying to satisfy these demands and to remedy the extraordinary complaints of those people.

Now, I do not know—it would be perilous for me to refer to Ireland, because if I speak on any subject I say exactly what I mean. I will only say this about Ireland, that Southern Ireland has taken immensely too much of our attention since the armistice, immensely too much; and a great many Englishmen, and I dare say a great many of you over here, are now coming to the opinion that Ireland—Southern Ireland—is not the most precious jewel in our imperial crown and that in point of fact Southern Ireland, having lost the most glorious opportunity, when she was a member of the noblest family of peoples in all history, is now not much good to the British Empire. Many of us are disposed not to attach very great importance to the supposed strategetic dangers that might await on future wars if Southern Ireland were turned out of the Empire, where she evidently is not at home, to be a little nation not capable of much mischief or much good. That is the opinion that many of us are coming to; and you who in your history have a glorious and a wistful passage relating to what happened to the United Empire Loyalists when they came over here, might perhaps make a suggestion as to the way in which the Loyalist element of Southern Ireland might be treated. Certainly if we were richly to compensate every Loyalist in Southern Ireland who might desire to be evacuated, we could do so and leave a margin, with the money which we are at present expending on bearing the total cost of Irish education and meeting other large charges of administration. I think it would be a great relief to the British Empire if Southern Ireland were told to go her own way, only remembering that just as Great Britain has a supervising interest in the foreign politics of Belgium, so we should have a say by a great navy in regard to any treaties which she might wish to form; and inasmuch as she has no coal and no iron and very little timber, I do not see what the future history of Southern Ireland, until she came back humbly, would be, excepting that of an economic dependent upon the only country in the world that would want to buy her agricultural produce. (Applause)

I really think that, as the British Empire has a great many things to do that seem to me more important than looking after those people who constantly tell us how alien they are from us, (and who certainly behave as though they were alien) if we told them that they had not behaved as men who were bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh and heart to heart with us, that we wanted to live for our own Imperial family, for our sons and our daughters, our kinsmen of this great Dominion, of Australia and South Africa and other parts in heart and purpose a United Empire. A courageous statesman might well do this and something further and if he did it, the world that cares for human interests, would not be sorry. (Loud applause)

I have specially marked down the labour question for the Women's Canadian Club, so I will not deal with that here. But this I will deal with; I should like to deal with the story of that atrocious thing, the Internationale. I should like to show you, if I could, that what is called Internationalism, as it is worked in the world of labour, is really nothing else than Pan-Germanism intended for consumption and operation outside of Germany. That is exactly what it is. I just throw that out; I cannot now give you my evidence, for I have something else to say that I think is almost more important; but I have got it, and I am prepared to give it.

I want to deal with something that that Pan-German movement of thought has really been doing amidst industrialism throughout the British Empire. In the German Empire it has been busy in exalting the entity called the Superman. You know something about him, don't you? (Laughter) But outside of Germany it has used the ethical side of its Internationalism to promote the interests of an entity called the Underdog. Now, do you know what I mean by that? I was speaking the other day at Hamilton and I was a little shocked to read in a local paper that I had said we had scorn, not pity, for the underdog. No, no; I am really quite a soft-hearted person in the right quarters, I hope. I am always ready, my time and other engagements permitting, to help a lame dog over the stile. There is nothing, almost, I like better to do than that; but what I do object to is, in this world of competition, with Germany still active in the prosecution of her mental and propagandist war, I do object to carry the underdog on my back. (Applause) Germany has done everything she can to inculcate a false humanitarianism in the British Empire, while she has taught the most horrid and brutal Nietzscheism within her own boundaries; and she has done it in order to emasculate and enfeeble the great power which is the only power in this world that she really has feared—the power of the British Empire.

Now, I do not attribute this curious worship of the underdog entirely to German influence. We have our soft side in England. We are wont to turn sentimental on occasion, and sometimes not on occasion. If I were privileged to give you a lecture to explain to you just how it has happened I think I could fairly clearly show this. The old healthy humanitarianism of the latter part of the eighteenth and the first part of the nineteenth century out of which modern democracy barely emerged, a democracy which had for itself two great principles—the greatest happiness of the greatest number, and the giving to every man his opportunity—how that became vitiated and perverted until we have reached a state of things in which nobody but the underdog is to have much opportunity. Instead of giving liberty to the wholesome powers of the nation and to the capable men and women to do their best, its wretched current is working day and night to prevent the capable people from using their capacity, and to load them with this imperious underdog.

But here is the worst of it. Just as the French Revolution began in a perverted sentiment of pity, so here is this perverted sentiment of pity going out sometimes to people who do not need it at all, like manual workers. Why should it? Why should a man, because be is called a manual worker, be looked upon as an object of pity? The only enjoyment I had out west was a week I had on a ranch working like a nigger. I did not want pity. It is a wholesome thing to do; I did not feel that I was an underdog when I was steadily working, shooting grain into a barn, chopping down trees, digging, and all that sort of thing. But this underdog idea is the idea of pity for certain classes and for certain persons; and after a time, pity goes beyond giving them help, and in order that the person that is pitied may not be disgruntled it gives him the top place. The underdog helped from being an underdog into a real worker, into a real servant of the community—that is the kind of underdog that British Imperialism and that sound humanitarianism are really concerned with. Just because a man works with his hands he has no special claim to be chosen to be a prophet, and because he is a mechanic he is not necessarily a heavenborn diplomatist; and because he happens to group himself with some other people in what he very strangely chooses to call a Labour Party, he has not therefore of necessity a claim to become the party that is to rule the destinies of the Empire.

I tell you that all those thoughts, trends, movements, really come out of a morbid pity which is not a humane thing. There is nothing more humane than British Imperialism. I go to my soldier friends when I want to find not only the most gallant but the most gentle hearts.

I go to men who have risked their lives for the world and for the women and the children if I want to find a true and sweet humanity. I do not go to those mouthers of theory; I do not go to those people who in the name of humanity would destroy the hopes of humanity, who would pull down that splendidly although slowly raised edifice of justice and of freedom which is the British Empire. We stand for what is human and for all that is human in the British Empire; all that belongs to human welfare hangs for its future hope of progress upon the welfare and the progress of the British Empire. There is none other name or organization under Heaven that can secure human progress in a career of courage and of sweetness and of ultimately irresistible genius but the British Empire; and because of this, my brothers, I meet you here in Canada.

Well, as your chairman has rightly said, I feel very much at home here in this true and splendid Canada, whose foundations were laid by the mighty patience, energy and courage of your first pioneers; whose great place to-day has been earned for her, and whose great promise to-day belongs to her because of what you and others in Canada did in the Great War for human liberty and love and righteousness.

The spreading splendour of your vast Dominion calls for the old determination of the pioneers (for when will pioneering in Canada be over?) calls on you to achieve what was denied those men of faith and indomitable courage, calls on you to make this country the land of beauty which they pictured as in a vision in those far off days. Remembering this land of pleasant atmospheres, lusty distances, unplumbed resources and stimulating calls such as the people of no other land have had sounded forth to them by Nature and by Providence, I wish to banish from your hearts and your policies all tendency to mitigate human energy. Let loose the strength of your Canadian hearts and limbs upon the glorious field of your opportunity. If I were not an Englishman I would be a Canadian. (Loud applause)

As I think of what you have of hope and opportunity given you by Nature and by God in this materially splendid land of yours, it seems to me that here within the boundaries of this great Dominion the Anglo-Saxon race has found a place where it can renew its youth; where it never need grow old, where that great spirit of adventure which, till lately, had to be satisfied in England by passing from the Island home to the fringes of the world might be fully satisfied with no seas to cross. Seeing this and feeling this with all my soul, and feeling the touch of the true atmosphere—human, patriotic and imperial—of this gathering to-day, I say "lift up your hearts". Our race is called to a greater career than it has yet run, and in this land, I believe, the greatest part of its career will find its place and movement. Here, under the shining of those old stars under which our forefathers fared forth—the stars of justice, of generosity, of courage, of obstinacy for truth—under those old stars I see a career for our race here in Canada that shall carry it, the ages through, always to a new glory. (Loud and prolonged applause)

PRES. MITCHELL expressed the hearty thanks of the Club to Prebendary Gough for his stirring message, the members standing and cheering enthusiastically.

The President of the British Empire Club of Providence, Rhode Island, Mr. Spencer Over, was the guest of the Club at this meeting and was introduced by President Mitchell in felicitous terms, the members applauding heartily as Mr. Over bowed his thanks.

QUO VADIS INDIA?*

AN ADDRESS BY RUSTOM RUSTOMJEE

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto

October 13th, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL,—Gentlemen, to-day we have, to speak to us, Mr. Rustom Rustomjee. I may say that Mr. Rustomjee has explained to me that the "jee" at the end means "esquire" (Laughter) Mr. Rustomjee is an authority on India. During the last year or so we have had several addresses on India, but I think Mr. Rustomjee will present some new angles of view, and will be able to explain to us many things which are at least rather confusing as we see them at this distance. The situation in India is such that we, as an Empire Club, ought to be fully informed, and we ought to take every opportunity we can to learn about that particular part of the Empire. I have pleasure in calling on Mr. Rustomjee.

MR. RUSTOMJEE

Mr. President, and fellow citizens of the British Empire,—How different is your reception from that which I received last March at Massey Hall in this city! But I remember well that the people who tried to break up my meeting were not Toronto people, were not Canadians, were not of the British Empire, though they were in the British Empire. (Hear, hear)

When I arrived in New York a few years ago, one of the newspapers of that metropolis of the United States of America said, "A Pharisee has come from India to teach us religion." When I went to Boston with my wife, the cultured ladies of that modern Athens thought I was a fortune-teller. Then, at Atlantic City, I was announced to speak on behalf of the American Red Cross and as I landed on the board-walk I saw a huge electric sign saying, "A Live Prince from India will lecture here this evening." (Laughter) Then, in the city of New York, at a reception held in honour of Lord Reading, then British Ambassador to the United States of America, I was ushered in as "His Excellency the Ambassador from Turkey." (Great laughter) But, Gentlemen, the best introduction was given to me by that group of papers controlled and managed by that abominable liar, Hearst (applause) in an article last September published throughout the United States, which stated, "Rustom Rustomjee, of Bombay, is a dirty British propagandist." Well, Gentlemen, if dissemination of correct information about my country be British propaganda, and if rendering unto Caesar the things that belong to Caesar, and to God that which belongs to God, be British propaganda, then I am not ashamed to be a British propagandist. (Applause) But I am not a servile apologist of Great Britain. I have never maintained that the British government of India was the kingdom of heaven established on this earth, or that British administrators of India are angels, because they are men with like passions as you and I have; they have made mistakes, and they are making mistakes; but I would rather be a dog and bay the moon than be such an ungrateful man as not to acknowledge that, on the whole, the British government of my country has been a great blessing to the teeming millions of India. (Applause)

---

*India: Whither goest thou?

Gentlemen, it is admitted, it has become almost a truism to say, that the English-speaking peoples of the world, the people of the British Empire and of the United States of America, constitute the hope of the world; that they are and must remain the great guardians of western or Christian civilization; yet there are forces—forces very virulent, poisonous and vindictive—which are seeking not only to drive a wedge between the peoples of the United States and this British Empire, but between the Mother-country and His Majesty's overseas dominions.

After a prolonged stay and much travelling, both in the United States of America and in the Dominion of Canada, the conviction is strongly and firmly borne in upon my mind that the headquarters of the arch-conspirators against Great Britain, particularly against England—much maligned England—are located in the United States of America, in the cities like New York, Boston, Chicago and San Francisco. It was my painful duty about two years ago to attend a meeting called for the purpose of inaugurating a "League of Oppressed Nationalities." I naturally supposed that there would be speakers representing the coloured peoples of the United States of America, representatives from the Philippine Islands, from Haiti, from Liberia, from Africa, from French, Dutch as well as British colonies and dependencies. Among the speakers there was an American of Irish descent, a Sinn Feiner; an East Indian; an Egyptian; a Parsee; a Chinese; a Japanese; a Russian; and the burden of their song was the oppression of Great Britain in their respective countries. (Laughter) No love of Ireland or of India or Egypt actuates these men, because when the announcement was proclaimed of the strike in Great Britain at that meeting by Dudley Field Malone, the whole audience rose up and cheered, and cried out, "The British Empire is at an end." When the names of Lenine and Trotsky were mentioned, the very roof of the Lexington Opera House seemed to have come down. I say there was no love for Ireland or India or Egypt; it is their latent hatred of Great Britain; and when they shouted that the British Empire was at an end I, in my humble way, in the corner of the theatre, shouted—and I was thankful to say that I was allowed to shout, and shout loud—that the British Empire was not at an end, but on the contrary, as the days went by her duties seemed more clear, her work more majestic, her goal more sublime. (Applause) So

I say it is not a love of India or Egypt or Ireland; it is their latent hatred of Great Britain; they are striving now to give a knock-out blow to the great work of civilization that Great Britain has erected throughout the continents of Asia and Africa, of Europe and America. Few sequels of the war have been more disconcerting to the average Briton than the discovery of his unpopularity. Before the great struggle his insularity, his inefficiency, had earned him a reputation abroad which was not without its humorous side; it left him a little uneasy but the war, he hoped, had swept all this away. It had burned, as in a furnace, the fine gold of the Englishman's real nature, the sincerity of his passion for liberty and justice, his tenderness for the oppressed and depressed races of the earth. Might not the mistakes and the mannerisms of the past be forgotten, and might not Great Britain now count upon the confidence if not the affection of those peoples for whom she has laboured and suffered? To such a question, what has been the reply? It is coming early from Ireland. It came from Egypt in March, 1919, when the very fellaheen, whom Great Britain had raised from the dust, murdered their brothers with every kind of savagery. It has come from Mesopotamia, where the Arabs, whom Great Britain has recently rescued from the galling yoke of the Turks, are in general revolt against British occupation. And it is coming from India.

To many it seems that this hostility to British rule is growing more serious and more acute every day; and may I assert, Sir, that it is coming in a different way from the great Dominions of the British Empire—from a section of the people of the British Empire? They are also matching a section of the people of the United States in playing the not very edifying game of "twisting the lion's tail."

Gentlemen, the burden of civilizing the world—a burden largely upon the shoulders of Great Britain—has become almost staggering. It would reflect no credit upon any part of the British Empire if she were forced to relinquish her charge. The most thrilling spectacle of the late war was the unity and determination of the whole British Empire, the disintegrated and isolated peoples of the Empire which set before them one common purpose and one common goal. They achieved that purpose; they reached that goal. Let the same unity of purpose now inspire them in a far nobler, though a harder work, that of the reconstruction of Europe, Asia and Africa. (Applause) Let nothing be done, let nothing be said, that would complicate the great problems Great Britain has tried to solve throughout the world. Remember that Great Britain is the heart of the Empire, and if the heart suffers the other members of the Empire are bound to suffer.

Quo Vadis India? Whither goest thou, India? Do you think for a moment, from the reports you have recently read in the newspapers, that Great Britain is going to lose India? That her dowry of peace and justice, her labours for the well-being of the teeming masses of India—that all these are to go for nothing? Is the British Indian Empire coming to an end? I emphatically say, No. (Applause)

As I said before, the work of Great Britain is becoming more majestic and more glorious as years roll by. Let no man admit the craven fear that those who have created the British Indian Empire are not able to hold it. That is not my reading of history. That is not my forecast of the future. To me the message is carved on the pages of the history of the world, that Great Britain's work in India, as in Egypt, as in all other of our dependencies and colonies, is righteousness, and that it will endure. (Applause) I do not deny that there is unrest in India. There is very serious unrest in India, and I venture to say here that the situation must become much worse before it becomes better. Many and various are the causes of this unrest. I have time only to deal with three chief causes—the economic cause of the unrest in India, the religious cause of the unrest in India, and the political cause of the unrest in India.

When Great Britain was fighting the Mesopotamia campaign, India not only supplied men—500,000 Indian soldiers; but all the food-stuffs and fodder that were required for that campaign were supplied from India and so we exhausted all our reserve stocks of food supply. Unfortunately, in the year 1919 the annual rains failed, famine conditions prevailed, and 35,000,000 of people were affected by famine conditions. It was not, as was said by one of your leading papers—I will not mention its name—that 35,000,000 of people died of starvation in British India. That paper ought to be ashamed of itself. Famine conditions affected 35,000,000 people; but as soon as the signs of the famine appeared on the horizon, we began to ameliorate the condition of the famine-stricken people of my country. Millions of bushels of wheat were imported from Australia, and I am thankful to say that the government and people of Australia sold us wheat at one-third of the price they charged the people of Great Britain. Famine relief works were opened; the collection of land revenue was suspended; several grants were given out, city and agricultural implements were given away gratis; fodder was given away free; and everything that could be done, was done to ameliorate the condition of the famine-stricken people of my country. I venture to say—and I hope that newspapers will print this—that not a hundred people died of actual starvation during that famine of 1919. (Applause) But in spite of all our efforts there was a great deal of distress, and that created a great deal of unrest among the masses of India. That is the economic cause of the unrest; the prices of food-stuffs went up high, multiplied a thousand per cent in some cases.

Then as to the religious causes of the unrest. When the war was going on, and Turkey entered the war on the side of Germany, we were fearfully apprehensive of a Holy War being declared by the Sultan of Turkey or the Caliph of Bagdad. Fortunately, thanks to the statesmen of Great Britain and of France, that calamity was averted, although a Holy War was declared by that Mad Mullah, the great Mohammedan leader, Kaiser William of Germany, the Mad Mullah of Berlin—which turned out to be a complete fiasco, for the Mohammedan soldiers fought side by side with Hindu soldiers and Australian soldiers in the Gallipoli Peninsula against the Turks themselves.

After the Armistice, much time was lost in giving out the peace terms to Turkey, but during the interregnum, gentlemen belonging to the same vocation as this gentleman (referring to the clergyman at his right) especially in England and in the United States of America, began to talk, saying, "The last war was fought not only to defeat Germany, but it was a blow aimed at the Moslem Church, at the Ottoman power, which is the same thing, because the glory of Islam is centred in Constantinople. The Mohammedan soldier, the Mohammedans of India who number about 72,000,000, began to think they were led astray by "perfidious Albion," and they began to agitate to restore the Ottoman power to the *status quo ante bellum,* and they are agitating now, and they have made common cause with the Russian Bolsheviki.

Now, Gentlemen, remember this: There are many more Mohammedans in the world than there are Christians, and they have two great advantages that the Christians do not possess; they are not divided into 1150 different denominations and sects. There is a superficial division of the shastra and sudra, but they present one united front, and they live on one solid rock of earth, right from southern India to northern India, Afghanistan, Persia, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Anatolia, the Caucasus, northern China, and a portion of south eastern Europe. So they have two great advantages. The Mohammedans of the whole world are restive at the present moment. The Ameer of Afghanistan has already entered into alliance with the Bolshevists of Russia. Persia has also entered into an alliance with the Russian Bolshevists, so, if there is nothing in common between Bolshevism and Islam, yet adversity has made them strange bed-fellows, and they are now marching side by side, hand in hand. What is their object? I wish the Christian peoples of the world would realize the danger of this; their one supreme object is to destroy the British Empire in Asia and Africa. One great obstacle to the progress of the fanaticism of Islam and the terrorism of Bolshevism—the two abominable menaces that threaten the very foundations of Christian civilization—is the religious cause of the unrest. These Mohammedans of India have made common cause with the Indian Nationalists or Bolshevists.

Now, the political cause of the unrest, I regret to say —because I have not come to this country to criticise anybody; my object is to do all in my power to draw the two great sections of the English-speaking peoples together, because I believe that they constitute the hope of the world—but I cannot help saying that the proclamation of the principle of self-determination in the governance of the peoples of the earth, without any modification or reservation, without taking into consideration the political status and stature of the peoples of the world, has done an incalculable harm to the peoples of Asia and Africa. (Hear, hear and applause) The impatient idealists of India, mostly priests, Brahmins, are working that principle for all it is worth.

Now, Gentlemen, do you know why the Brahmins of India, the fountain-head of all seditious movements, are against Great Britain? What is behind all the causes of the unrest, behind the movement of non-cooperation, of Ghandi? It is this: Before the Union Jack was felt in my country, or rather, before the British power was consolidated in India in 1858, by the Great Mutiny, the Brahmins of India were the lords of all they surveyed; all temporal and spiritual powers were centred in them; education was confined to the sons of the Brahmins alone. Great Britain came to India when India was divided and fighting; a hundred dynasties grew up, flourished, decayed, were forgotten for the wild adventurer who could muster a troop of horse and aspire to a train; so the first thing Great Britain did was to start universities, and start a public system of education open to all—the sons of the Sudras, the sons of the fighters, the sons of the merchants—all; and gradually these boys of the low classes of castes became educated, and displaced the Brahmins from their position of pelf and power, and the influence of the low caste increased. That was the cause of resentment by the Brahmins, and they organized the national movement. If you are interested in this subject, read Bevington Charles' book entitled, "Unrest in India." So the nationalists began to agitate for self-determination. Now, when that principle was announced first I think it was among the fourteen points. I was speaking at the Canadian Club in New York on that very day, and I said that the principle of self-determination was already in operation in India; we had self-determined to remain under the protection of the Union Jack. Had we not your self-determination when the war broke up in August, 1914, and India was denuded of all British troops? We could do something to shake off the so-called yoke of Britain, but instead of doing anything to aggravate the military position of Great Britain when she was plunged into her huge European war, instead of doing anything to renounce our fealty and unity to the British crown, Gentlemen of the Empire Club, we were the first in the field to offer our men and our money in defence of the integrity and honour and dignity of the British Empire. (Hear, hear and applause)

The war was declared on the 4th of August, and by the 11th of September of the same year 65,000 troops sailed in sixty-five transports, fully equipped and brilliantly led. They arrived in France, and according to Lord French, then commander-in-chief of the British forces, helped materially in checking the onward rush of the Germans towards the Channel ports. (Applause) After that, India sent out 250,000 troops. (Applause) Our soldiers fought side by side with your sons and your brothers on the fields of Flanders and France. Our Indian soldiers fought side by side with Australians on the Gallipoli Peninsula. Our soldiers fought side by side with the New Zealand cavalry in Palestine and Mesopotamia. Our troops fought in the Suez canal. Our troops fought side by side with soldiers of Botha's troops in East Africa. On all the fronts of the British Empire our soldiers fought—in Baku, in Italy, in Salonica, every where Indian troops fought. Not only did we supply men to Great Britain, but, Gentlemen, the peoples and Princes of India gave, as a gift to Britain, $2,000,000,000 in gold. (Applause) We did not loan the money; we gave it as a gift. (Laughter and applause) Not only did we supply men and money to Great Britain, but most of the ammunition that was required for the Mesopotamian campaign was manufactured in India out of Indian material, and made by Indian labour, and paid for from Indian revenues. (Applause)

Most of the food-stuffs and fodder that were required for the British armies in the Mesopotamian campaign were supplied from India. The people of Great Britain were touched, and on August 20th, 1917, Mr. Edwin S. Montagu, Secretary of State for India, declared in the House of Commons that the ultimate aim and object of the British government of India was to give India responsible government as an integral part of the British Empire. With that object in view Mr. Montagu sent out a commission to find out how far such powers and privileges and liberties as are enjoyed by Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa could be accorded to the people of India. On its return from India, after making very exhaustive researches and inquiries on the spot, Mr. Montagu introduced a bill into the House of Commons. It became the Government of India Act in 1919. Gentlemen, if you are interested in constitutional government and the history of constitutional government, read the report of Chancellor Montagu, issued in June, 1918.

Early this year, in the city of Delhi, the ancient and modern capital of India, was witnessed an event whose significance and importance to the world's history may be regarded as unique, as years roll on. A new era was ushered in by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught. I said it was a unique event, for never in Asia has any people of any of those ancient countries been so freely and so generously dowered with the gift of free and responsible government. (Hear, hear) The Magna Charta was wrested from the unwilling hands of King John by the barons at Runnymede; but 328,000,000 of

India have freely, though cautiously, been placed in the path of democracy and responsible government by the people of Great Britain. (Hear, hear and applause) It is an achievement of which every Briton, to whatever part of the British Empire he or she belongs, ought to be proud. (Hear, hear)

What is this new era? India is divided into eight provinces. In each of these provinces there are Legislative Councils, or Provincial Parliaments, elected by the people of India; and those councils have Indian ministers appointed by the governments of the provinces, but they must have the confidence of the councils. As in England, the King appoints the ministers, and they must have the confidence of the House of Commons. To these Indian ministers are transferred important branches of the administration of the province of India—trade, industry and commerce, land, revenue, education, forests, sanitation—all those important branches of the administration are entirely controlled and managed by Indian ministers who are responsible to the councils and the councils are responsible to the electors at the head of the government of India. In this way the Governor General is assisted by the Cabinet, or council of six members, three of whom are Indians. He is again assisted by two Houses of Parliament, the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State, something like your House of Commons and Senate. To the Legislative Assembly is confined the power of the press. We have obtained fiscal autonomy without fighting for it, and we have made use of that autonomy. Only about two and a half months ago India was in need of greater revenue than was obtainable by ordinary means, and it was suggested in the assembly that a moderate duty on cotton goods imported from England to India, manufactured in Lancashire, should be increased from three per cent. to eleven and a half per cent. As soon as Lancashire manufacturers heard of this, a hue and cry was raised in Great Britain, and that petition was made to the government of India. Deputation after deputation waited upon Mr Montagu, Secretary of State for India; but what was the reply of Mr. Montagu, and particularly what was the reply of the finance minister of India—an Englishman, by the way—a much-maligned Englishman? He said, "The interests of India must stand supreme; India is the mistress of her own finances; the days of mandates have gone, and gone forever." (Applause) It is written in the preamble of the act of 1919 that at the end of ten years a commission will go out to find out what further powers could be entrusted to the people of India. That is slow, but certainly India will have complete responsible government—I do not like the words "home rule" because of their association. (Laughter)

Gentlemen, do you know what that means—to have found a continent as big as Europe without Russia, with three times the population of the whole North American continent put together, torn by internecine strife since the beginning of the Christian era, a constant prey to foreign invaders since the time of Alexander the Great, 330 B.C.; without peace; without any system of justice; without any system of jurisprudence; without economic or financial stability; and then to have transformed India within three generations into a well-governed, prosperous, on the whole peaceful, democratic commonwealth of Indian nations? That is an achievement without parallel in the history of mankind. (Prolonged applause)

Gentlemen, this is the Empire Club. I see some of our Canadian friends objected to the word "Empire". At the Imperial Press Conference in Ottawa a Canadian —shall I say a statesman, or "politician?" (laughter) suggested that they should change the name of the Conference to British instead of Imperial. Well, what is the Empire? Would you put the construction of Empire as a vast organism resting on a theory of voluntary cooperation, and capable of development of common sense and justice? It is necessarily a modern invention springing from the ties of common origin, cemented by the loyalty of common inheritance, and recently confirmed and strengthened by the blood of martyrs in the cause of liberty and progress and civilization. In such a conception of empire there is no place for autocracy or despotism. (Applause) To use the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, it is "a perfect co-operation without coercion; closer bonds without any bondage."

I see, also, that some of your Canadians objected to the word King. (Great laughter) Oh, I don't speak about Canadian politics (laughter) I am speaking of our Empire scheme. But I think with the British Indian empire if there was no king we should have to invent one. The King of England is no mere figurehead; he represents the traditions of the British Empire. (Hear, hear) He symbolizes within his personality the unity in diversity of the British Empire; drawing within its sphere the various and often conflicting elements of the British Empire, training them to make common sacrifices for the common heritage of liberty and justice, which are the distinguishing characteristics of the British Empire. He symbolizes, as I say, the unity of the British Empire. I do not know why the Church of England clergymen should be obliged to pray that God might bless our King. (Hear, hear) Gentlemen, I have done. I want to talk five minutes more, Mr. President. ("Go on") Gentlemen, I started with the statement of a truism; let me end with the statement of another truism. It is always a truism that Great Britain at the present time is passing through the most severe trials of her existence. (Hear, hear) All the forces of evil—the ecclesiastical, the autocracy of the dreamers of India, the autocracy of the proletariats of Russia, the autocracy of Islam, the autocracy of the hyphenates of the United States of America (great laughter) and of the Dominion of Canada (laughter) all are seeking to destroy the influence and power for good of Great Britain. Gentlemen, I have travelled all over Africa, all over Asia, all over Europe, all over Northern America, and I have come to the conclusion that with all her faults, and with all her foibles, and all the mistakes she has committed—for she is always blundering, but with good intentions, with honesty of purpose, with unimpeachable motives—Great Britain is incomparably, incontestably the greatest force that worketh for righteousness, liberty, and democracy throughout the world. (Hear, hear and applause) It is time for the Dominions to stand together, stand by her when she is striving her best to solve the many complicated problems that she is confronted with, confronted as she is by enemies in all quarters of the globe. Turn where we will, within, around, the voice of great events is proclaiming to us, "co-operate that we may continue."

Now, therefore, while everything here and abroad forbodes ruin to those who persist in their hopeless struggle against the spirit of the age; now while the crash of the mighty thrones of Europe is still ringing in our ears; now while the roof of a Dutch castle affords an ignominous shelter to the would-be conqueror of the world; now when we see on every side ancient societies subverted and great institutions dissolved; now, in this our day of salvation, we must take counsel not of prejudice, not of narrow national pride or the spirit of nationality, but of history, of reason, of the wisdom of the ages that are past, and the signs of this most momentous time. We must renounce, in a manner, the world's high expectations with which our entrance into the world's great conflict was hailed by the peoples of the Empire; we must try and renew the youth of the world; we must try and save society, divided against itself; we must try and save the multitudes endangered by their ungovernable passions. The time is short; the opportunity may pass away. Then sing with me:—

A song of hate is a song of Hell;
Some there be that sing it well.
Let them sing it loud and long,
We lift our hearts in a loftier song:
We lift our hearts to heaven above,
Singing the glory of her we love—

England!

Bind her, grind her, burn her with fire,
Cast her ashes into the sea—
She shall escape, she shall aspire;

She shall arise to make men free;
She shall arise in a sacred scorn,
Lighting the lives that are yet unborn,
Spirit supernal, Splendour eternal,

ENGLAND!

The audience expressed appreciation of the address by rising and giving three cheers and a tiger.

HOW EDUCATION STRENGTHENS THE LINKS OF EMPIRE

AN ADDRESS BY PROF. C. R. FAY

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, October 20, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: We have with us to-day Professor Fay, lately from Cambridge and now of the University of Toronto. (Applause) The subject on which he is to speak is one that will interest all those who are in earnest about the welfare of the Empire; and amongst the various links of Empire which we have had described to us during the last twelve months, the link of Education is not the weakest. Professor Fay is going to tell us how best these links can be forged and strengthened through the medium of education. I have much pleasure in calling on Professor Fay.

PROFESSOR C. R. FAY

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—Everybody will agree that sentiment is a very important thing in Imperial affairs, but I also invite you to consider this point—that sentiment unaided by knowledge is not able to effect everything. I sometimes think the tendency to-day is to over-estimate the place of sentiment, and to trust to mere feeling to solve the problems that can only be solved by the application of the best brains we have in all parts of the Empire. Therefore, while I do not for a moment suggest that sentiment is not a mighty force, I want to try and show you that there is something more than that in the field of activities, which is indeed very closely connected with sentiment, and that is the field of education.

Everyone of us here bears in him or on him the marks of the experience that he went through in the last few years, in particular the period of the war. One saw it from one angle, one from another. The angles from which I saw it were twofold—the training of the troops in France, and the organization of contact between the different arms in France—the two angles of training and liaison. I confess that when I went from college to France to do the work of a machine gunner in the line, an old-fashioned spectacled don as I was in those days, I never expected that the war would take such a form that I should end up as a teacher, and that is how I did end up—a teacher of machine gun tactics.

Then it began to dawn on me that this thing called war, instead of being a blind unorganized thing, into which you put sentiment and little else, was a most carefully and elaborately thought-out thing, prepared for by month after month of the most careful training, each new arm, each new mechanical device requiring a school to get it generalized throughout the army and each new manoeuvre requiring elaborate rehearsal In our battles we put our education to the test—six months' training of a splendid new division, followed by half an hour or an hour of fighting, and then they were gone. Now, coming back home from that experience. I kept pondering over this thought: If all this organization and education were necessary, and worked so well when the object was war, cannot we switch these efforts into the service of peace? (Applause) Cannot we adopt the same kind of determined purpose in order to secure social results? This inevitably involves schools and education. Schools and education were written all over the work done in France. Is there not a similar place for them in the purposes of peace?

A second thought I came home with was this: I had read about Canada; in 1909 I had made a hurried visit to Canada; I was one of those who took a month on a trip out west in which you spend most of the days in a railway train, where you are shown all the wonders and all the newest things and all the largest things, and go away overwhelmed and exhausted and understanding nothing. I said to myself, How different it was in France! I had the big honour of working there in close contact with the Canadian corps. It so happened that it was my task to collect the reports of the various machine gun units up and down the front—French experience, the experience of the Imperial divisions, the experience of the Canadian machine gunners (for the machine gun was my special department) and I found out that each of the different allies was contributing particular solutions towards the great problem of how best to handle machine guns.

One of the ways in which it was most effectively employed, namely for overhead barrage fire, was, as you may know, pioneered by the Canadian machine gunners. (Applause) There was a regular service of liaison, interchange of documents and interchange of people, and interchange of teachers. Infantry and artillery officers used to come down and teach at our G. H. Q. machine gun school, and we went to their schools, and thus there was an interweaving of experience. The thing we fought was the thing we had learned from each other, putting together all that was best of every man's bit of experience, combining it for one purpose, which in our case was, the right use of the machine gun in support of the attacking infantry.

Now, that was no mere experiment. We went on month after month, and I might almost say year after year, until in the end we had extracted certain fundamental principles of co-operative action which were absolutely true. It has been well said that the principles of war are few, but their application to different conditions requires the highest exercise of ingenuity.

Now, what is my moral for our purpose to-day? It is this. I have been always a very keen student of the Empire, and I have witnessed this inevitable evolution taking place that as the different self-governing dominions attain to full nationhood, many of the old bonds of Empire must change their form. We know quite well, as we read our history, that there was a time when the political government of this country was mainly directed from Downing Street, by officials sent out from England. We also know that the main military establishment of Canada was similarly controlled by the Imperial authorities. We also know that the fiscal policy of Canada was dictated from England. But all through the nineteenth century, as a result of co-operative action between the Dominion and the mother country, there has been a gradual handing over of functions, which has now attained to its full dimensions in the sense that both in war and peace Canada is as fully as England (as I understand it) a complete nation.

But this development that has taken place has inevitably reacted on Imperial relations; and there was a school of people before the war who argued like this: "The tie of Empire is fading away into nothing; cannot we hold it down at a certain point and introduce, let us say, some close scheme of political unification or political federation?" I am not here to discuss the pros and cons of that argument, but what I do want to say is that we have to be extraordinarily careful before committing ourselves to a solution which would insult the sense of nationhood which undoubtedly is felt in all the self-governing dominions. We have to give scope for the two feelings of Empire and nationality side by side.

Here I think the experience of the war has been profitable. At first it was thought that to have a Canadian war office in London and a separate Canadian unit in France was subversive of unity; but I am safe in saying that nothing helped the Imperial forces more than the fact that there were those distinctive units from the Dominion working within the larger unit falling in with the common plan, but making their own peculiar contribution to it. It was very obvious in many cases that the Canadians, through their independent position, either got power or took power to do things which were viewed with hesitation by the Imperial authorities. (Applause) I remember an incident in connection with the employment of the machine gun barrage at a time when it was a novelty. G. H. Q. objected, urging first of all, that it would disconcert the infantry, and secondly, that it was unsafe, because the first bullet from each belt went low. The Canadian authorities replied that neither of tnese objections were felt in the Canadian corps. The infantry expressed their delight at the plan; and as to the technical difficulty about the first bullet going low, that was overcome in the Canadian corps by removing the first bullet from each belt. (Laughter)

And now, I come to the application. I believe that even if there is no central political authority, nevertheless we can maintain the unity of the Empire in a real sense provided that we have a constant interchange of ideas and of men to mold our general development to a common purpose. (Applause)

Now, Gentlemen, that is why I am in Canada. I believe that I can best help the cause you have at heart by going back and letting my country know what the real Canada is. That is my purpose. And even as I come here from Cambridge, so I hope the day will come when each big university in the self-governing dominions will send its students to do research work in Oxford and Cambridge, and when the professors also will interchange, so that we may achieve real unity of purpose, working in sympathy to a common goal. I believe that is adding to sentiment something which is sensible; in other words that it is common sense.

Let me develop this point. Suppose we try to envisage a future in which large numbers of English people come over to Canada. Now, we do not want a state of affairs to grow up in which the only use that Canada has for the old country is an annual draft of farm labourers and domestic servants. If that is the only point of contact, the Empire goes in ten years. But of course what is perfectly true is that there are certain fields of employment in Canada into which it is desirable more people should enter. The land is an asset that Canada has to offer in unlimited abundance; and I venture to say that the schools and the training authorities ought to take their part in securing that what you get from the old country are not the unemployables, because those are the people who sign up as farm labourers as you will find out when you go to the old country; (laughter) and if you do not understand that you will reject the best potential farmers, who do not register as such. The young fellows, the boy scouts of 17 or 18, do not write themselves down as farm labourers and these are the type of settlers which you should aim at securing.

My next point is, that in the improved relations that are coming to exist between the universities and the world of business, the business men are taking a share in the training of the young man who comes to them from the university. The university takes him a certain way, gives him a general training, the power of thought, the power of logical reasoning, but does not specialize him prematurely. The business man comes in at this point and puts him through his industrial apprenticeship, specializing him to his own purpose. We are thus getting an improved liaison between the university and the world of business; we have a proper channel of communication; but the university cannot do everything; the business man must help in the work himself.

Now, to apply this to our original problem, the relation between the old country and the new; I think, similarly, we shall in the future have to regard a person coming out to this country as a person that the old country has carried a certain way in training; and the healthiest relation will be one in which he is able to go to some training place and be trained for work on the land. Then you will get your class of boy scouts on top. It is absurd to suppose that you will be able to get fully trained men and nothing else. You will never get that sort only, and if you make the attempt, what you will get will be industrial refuse; they will be your unemployables in years to come.

You must then expect to take a share in the training of the young people who come out; and you must assume responsibility for their placement and supervision in their early days out here.

If that aspect of common responsibility by the old country and the new for their young citizens, alike British, whether in England or Canada, be worked out, I believe you will have a much finer future, and I believe you will avoid the disaster,—as I think it would be—of regarding the old country as a place from which there comes an annual draft of domestic servants and farm labourers. (Applause)

What I am suggesting is but a very little contribution to a big problem. It is not a great scheme of imperial unification; it is no great ready-made solution, but I think that more and more we are coming to feel that the course of trade depends on understanding by one country, of the commercial wants of the other; and though I, for one, am a believer in imperial preference, I think it is not enough to have that if you do not understand the wants of the other country, because then surely you must lose the trade. This idea of mutual understanding, beginning at the schools, ought to permeate right through the different classes of the business world—your merchants, your consular service, and so on—and I think you will find that by the increase of common knowledge you will have got a wonderful fertilizing source of further trade. It is no great scheme, I believe, which will create the real bonds of the future; but it is by this steady work of mutual understanding, piece by piece, through all levels of society, that we shall really in the end get further. And I do not believe that this is a cause of despair. People have said to me, "If you don't have a federation, then the Empire has gone." I refuse to accept that conclusion. You might just as well have argued that because the Canadian corps was practically independent in France, therefore it would have to drive a bargain with the Imperial authorities in order to get its due. There was no such thing; there was co-operation at once and throughout. Therefore let us get to work in our new imperial environment. Let us not think that we are trying to hinder and cramp the sense of nationality; if we did that, it would be hopeless. Nationality is the expression of a nation's life, and without it Canada would be hopeless. Nationality is the expression of a nation's life, and without it Canada would not be what it is to-day. We have come into new relations in a different way, and I, as a teacher, believe there is a sad amount of superficial knowledge that passes as real knowledge—the information of tourists staying for a few weeks. Let us replace that by the effort to live long enough in the new country to look at it from the new country's angle, and then we can go back with that knowledge and that knowledge will be of imperial service. We want to see our imperial problems through Canadian spectacles, through South African spectacles, through Australian spectacles and so on. That is the way in which our whole policy is to be built up. For the British Empire of the future must be the British Commonwealth of self-governing nations.

So, just as I believe we teachers or business men from England can do something—I put it to you, cannot you help, too? Cannot you use your influence that there shall be a system of your students and teachers coming to the old country? Cannot you in business, while in England, look at what the universities there are doing, and examine the problems they are trying to tackle. We must not be content with a one-way traffic—the old country constantly out; we must have a return traffic. Just as the Canadians in France gave as much to us as we gave to them, so we must look to any industrial future in which we have as much need of you as you of us. Only when there is that return traffic can there be a real traffic, a real imperial policy.—There is one man's idea, and I thank you for this opportunity of expressing it, and for your attention. (Loud applause)

President Mitchell asked Mr. Hewitt, Ex-President, to express the thanks of the meeting.

MR. ARTHUR HEWITT

I count this a privilege. The future of this country, it seems to me, is entirely bound up in education; there has got to be a greater fitness for business, more scientific preparation for business; and I believe the best preparation for business is a University course. If Canada is to be a leader in industry, in commerce, in finance, and in all the directions which go to build up a successful country, it will never be done until the basis of our education is sound and good. (Hear, hear)

As an Empire Club, we are distinctly interested in seeing to it that all our development is along Empire rather than along purely national lines. Our country will succeed and will attain high standing just so far as she keeps close in co-operative counsel with the mother-land. I think the lesson we have got from Prof. Fay to-day is one that will be exceedingly helpful to us. These Club luncheons do not exist for the purpose of tickling our ears and giving us pleasing sentiments expressed in a very fine way, as many of our addresses are, but it is truth we want, put up in good measure, so that we may apprehend and understand what is our individual duty. We can all spend some portion of our time in giving thought to the important problems that are before us from time to time; and the one that has been brought to our attention to-day is most important. To have this problem and possible solution presented to us so skilfully, and so pleasantly, as Professor Fay has done is something we do appreciate very highly, and I desire to express your thanks and my own to Professor Fay for his kindness in coming to us.

The audience expressed their appreciation of the address by rising and loudly applauding the speaker.

PRESENT CONDITIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN

AN ADDRESS BY SIR ROBERT A. FALCONER, K.C.M.G., LL.D., PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, October 27, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: *Gentlemen,*—We are honoured and proud to have to-day as our guest a citizen of Toronto, one of Canada's greatest citizens. (Applause) During the past summer Sir Robert went, in his capacity as President of the University of Toronto, to a Conference of Universities of the Empire, held in London; and while there, in addition to his work in connection with education, he had an opportunity to study the situation and the conditions in the Old Country. He is going to speak to us to-day about what he saw, and tell us something of what is happening at the heart of Empire. (Applause) During his visit he was honoured with degrees from Oxford University, from Edinburgh University, and from Dublin University, and that is a thing for a Canadian to be proud of. (Applause) I have much pleasure in introducing Sir Robert Falconer.

SIR ROBERT FALCONER

General Mitchell and Gentlemen,—It is always a peculiar pleasure to speak to one's own friends in one's own home, and I appreciate very much the honour that the Club has done me in asking me to say something to you this afternoon on what one saw in Britain during the past summer.

I am always suspicious, Mr. Chairman, of the people who go to a place and stay about three weeks in it, and then come back and give their impressions. (Laughter) They either have a very high opinion of their own powers of intuition, or they are contented, and think others are contented, with looking a very slight distance below the surface. My only justification in speaking to you to-day is this: That although, as many here know, I spent two or three months in England during the last summer, I was not visiting England for the first time, and really therefore was in a position, perhaps, to institute comparisons, because as a young man I was six years in Edinburgh, and knew Britain well at that time, and of course have been often back since. Therefore my impressions are not quite those of a man who has simply gone hurriedly into a country and come out of it. You will therefore bear with me, and perhaps pardon me if I seem to speak more dogmatically than might be warranted by the short time that I was there.

Anyone who arrived in England last June was bound to be struck by the thought that England was smokeless. Those cities that on former occasions one had seen covered with a thick pall were lying under the open cloudless sky, and in many a place the people had a chance to realize what the environment of their city really was. For instance, I heard more than one person say that the Glasgow folk were beginning to brag that they had beautiful surroundings; they never knew that they had any before. (Laughter) But there was one phase of this smokeless sky that was very sad, and that was the unemployment, due to the coal strike. Then the cloudless sky, with the sun streaming down on the country for several months, only added to the existing burden, because for many weeks people were becoming anxious about the shortage of crops. And yet one heard very little real complaint, and the general impression one got in going about through various parts of the country was that England was like a very strong man—silent, bearing a burden, but in process of adjusting that burden to his shoulders, not petulant as to its weight, not threatening to throw it off, but trying, as he adjusted his burden, to get his footing here or there; beginning to move, and trying to move in such a way that he would do so with the least effort. There was no threat lest, from revolution within, England would simply toss the burden off its shoulders; nor was there the anticipation, so far as I could judge, that before the end this man would become so weary of his burden that he would sit down by the road-side and throw that burden off simply through weariness, and not complete his journey. As I say, what I saw was resolution—quiet resolution, endeavouring to adjust itself to its extremely heavy burdens. That, in general, was the view that I have come away with—the impression that was made upon me.

On the other hand, while one hears a great deal about the economic situation—and I may have to say a few words about that afterwards—I got the impression that, as in life generally, the problems that are most distressing are not the economic problems. I think that that is so in life. You take money losses, as a rule—we all try to, I suppose—in a calm way. Money losses are trying, very trying, and yet money losses are not those that touch us most deeply. Men lose their fortunes and they go through the rest of their life happy. What touches us is what circles around the personal elements of our life—the losses in our families, the losses of our friends, the antagonisms that we meet with others; the hostile environment in which we have to do our work, the necessity of constant struggle with people with whom we cannot agree; those things, if they are forced upon us from day to day, give us an attitude to life that, if long continued, may embitter us; but I doubt whether men are long embittered over money losses. And so in fact it was the human problems, I believe, that distressed England most; it is Ireland; it is the attitude of labour; it is the terrible losses that have come through the war,—their brightest young men who will never come back.

In addition to these, there is the burden of Empire; not only this Empire, but what is involved in the relations between this Empire and other lands. Europe is now looking to England as the one who, more than any other, seems to be in the position of a judge and an arbitrator between the warring foes. And there is the burden of India. Those are human problems, and it is those problems which I believe in the long run are causing most distress to England.

Take Ireland. No one could be in Ireland, as I was for the first time, in June, when things were at their worst, without recognizing what a thick cloud of depression the people were living under—a cloud so thick and murky that it chilled their hearts to the core, and at that time there was no ray of sunlight breaking through. Great men of Ireland such as the Provost of Trinity, formerly Archbishop of Dublin, with whom I had the privilege of staying for a few days, spoke as though they saw no ray through the darkness. Others whom one met in the same way had nothing to tell one as to any solution of the difficulty. One afternoon we were for a few hours up at the National University of Ireland of which, since we left, De Valera has been made Chancellor—even there the old Irish gayety had disappeared, and there was reticence on all sides; people living surrounded by others from whom they knew not what to expect; the armed force dashing through the finest streets of Dublin. One afternoon there were at least six armed cars rushing, one after another, past my room in Trinity College. From my window I could look out on the lawn of Trinity College where, less than ten days before, a young lady sitting beside her betrothed had been killed at an athletic meeting. On the way to Belfast we saw the smashed railway carriages and dead horses from that disaster that had happened just two or three days before. Belfast, it is true, was more certain of itself, very much more certain of itself, but the Southern Unionist, when you told him that, would grow somewhat irritated and say, "Yes, that conscious rectitude of the north has made our problem all the more difficult." And so one came away from Dublin with a feeling of relief.

I remember, as one stepped on board the boat to leave Kingstown, one felt somewhat like a man who had left a battle and saw the soldiers coming in, and knew that those who had been left behind had to fight this thing through. One was greatly relieved to get out of the range of the fighting. You know what that would be, General, (turning to President Mitchell) ; no, you don't, because you stayed in—(laughter)—but I know what it was like; and there was a sense, possibly, of dereliction in not staying in.

Now, England is face to face with that problem; and Ireland at that time was able to give no solution. The solution seems to be somewhere nearer to-day. They all admit, and I think we must all see, that force is no solution to it. The extermination of the Irish people would in itself be a hideous human disaster, and there is no security that way. There must be some way out, surely, some other way, and yet what that is to be, who can tell. We all hope that this Conference will lead us out.

Now, you may not all agree with me, but many of you do agree with me in believing that when human affairs reach their worst—in fact I do not know why we should wait so long—that when human affairs at least reach their worst, and man has done his best, and the end has not come, there is such a thing in this world as Divine reconciliation, and there is a time when men should take themselves to prayer. There is far more wrought in the universe and among the affairs of men by prayer than ordinary people believe; and I believe myself that now is the time when, if it has never been done before, those of us who do believe in the unseen forces of righteousness that are guiding the world, that we who do believe in those things, should betake ourselves to supplication on behalf of what is going on now in Britain. What other way out there may be I cannot see. (Applause)

That was the situation as I saw it in Ireland.

Of what I saw in England, the second feature that I shall dwell upon, concerns education; and as you may expect, I would linger upon that a little longer. There was, Mr. Chairman, as you mentioned, this great Congress of the Universities held in Oxford last July, and all the universities of the Empire were represented. I presume there were 250 delegates and representatives; 57 from India alone, many of them natives; and, I am thankful to say, eight of them from the national universities of Ireland taking their share in the conference. It was a very representative gathering of people, and for four days they discussed all sorts of educational problems.

What those of us who come from overseas endeavoured to say in Britain and at that Congress was this: now is the time for Britain to come forward and take the intellectual leadership of the world. The German universities are closed, and in our time students either from the United States or Britain or overseas will not go in any numbers to Germany; France may get some, but the opportunity is for Britain. Britain has been reticent and modest; has not imposed her laws upon the world or exposed her intellectual wares to the gaze of the world at large; but this Conference was in a certain sense a stock-taking, and Britain told her own relations —because we were her very immediate relations, very few Americans being there—what she could do. There were many discussions as to the state of education in England, and one of our pleasant discoveries was this—to realize that in educational affairs England was quite up-to-date, quite as much so as we are in the Empire at large, or as they are in the United States. Now, we have thought often, that in such matters as courses for commerce, administration, social service, various kinds of technical training, that this continent was far ahead of Britain. I have come back believing that we have very little to teach Britain in those respects (hear, hear) and that the new provincial universities particularly are manning themselves to meet new needs that have not been and probably could never have been taken care of in the older universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

Now, that up-to-dateness in ordinary affairs was, as I say, very refreshing, and it shows that Britain is able to take her place alongside of others. Then again, the emphasis that she laid upon research was very comforting. A whole morning was devoted to that, under the presidency of Lord Robert Cecil, who gave a very penetrating and masterful deliverance; and in England one realizes that there is still the old characteristic to be found that gives her a type of education different from that of France or of Germany. Germany had organized her science and her learning through universities sustained by Government. France has organized her science through acadamies and technical publications, everything being directed from a centre, both in France and in Germany, though in different ways. Britain has always been chary of that central direction; she has relied on individual genius, and the right of the individual scholar or scientist to pursue his own way, very much more than those other countries did. She lost somewhat in the very process; she lost the concentration and the driving force that come from organization, but she always has had individual genius that has put her, if anything, above the others. In addition to that, unlike France and Germany, she pursued the pure idea less than they did, and always had her eye on the practical application; England was a great Empire that had administrative power over the world, and what she won by thought of intellect she always wished to put into practical effect somewhere or other. These qualities are still obvious in English education.

In fact, we had a very remarkable discussion one afternoon which has seemed, the more I have thought about it, to be indicative of an underlying characteristic of the English people. We were listening to papers on the financial support of universities, given by the principal of Edinburgh and the principal of Liverpool chiefly, in both of which papers there was a demand for more government assistance from London; they said the British universities could not survive unless they had more assistance, and Whitehall seemed to be the place from which it should come. However, they repudiated anything like nationalization, and some of us on this side told them about the way in which our state universities worked here, and that we had not found ourselves in difficulties; we had not had undue control from government sources; in fact, that there was a freedom through our organization that allowed large and rapid expansion. They would have none of it; no central control for them; no nationalization for them. Help from the Government, yes; but not such help as would in any way interfere with their individual development. They grew warm over it, so warm that one very well-known man thought that he might have hurt our feelings a bit by the emphasis that he laid upon his point. That illumined to me the attitude of England in many and many a way. She will never have her education so organized and so co-ordinated that it is to be directed by one central board of officials. The individual Englishman will always demand his own rights and the expression of his own individuality, in education or anything else. (Loud applause)

Now, he does need, however, a larger organization, and he does need that his powers shall be focussed; and I think that is the contribution that we from overseas may have made to this conference—that we emphasized to those practical English institutions that now is their opportunity, with their innate power, with their strong individuality, with their research, now is their opportunity to so adjust their old conditions as to open their treasures to us to come from overseas. And they are willing to do so. Those benefits that we will mutually give to one another will, I think, be far-reaching in their effcets.

I spoke of England being up-to-date in education. She is up-to-date in education; she is up-to-date as a democracy should be up-to-date; and as you go through

England and see education in all its branches, from the school up through its various ramifications to the universities in their different types, you realize that England has discovered that a democracy depends upon a thorough and variegated education; and so far as I could judge, England is ahead of nearly all other nations in the way in which she watches for power showing itself, and then gives an opportunity to that power to develop. (Applause) You would be astonished to discover the very complicated and expensive system of scholarships that are awarded, from the schools right up to the universities. We have here nothing to compare with what they have in England in that way. A poor boy in any school, if he shows the power, can almost always get the opportunity, and is helped up through the schools, in all the varieties of the schools, whether he is heading for a university or for technical training. He has the opportunity given to him by scholarships to make the best out of himself in the direction in which he gives promise for the future. One of the most distinguished men in England to-day, who holds an educational position that has no superior—and I think he came up through scholarships, although he did not say so—said to me, "There is not a boy or a girl in England, who has the power, who cannot, through our system of scholarships, work right through to the very best that Cambridge has to offer." Now, if there is anything better than that in democracy I do not know it. (Applause) We in this country are behind in that. Just to-day, in my office, I had a very brilliant student who has stopped her work this year because she cannot get $300, and if I could tell you the story I know it would move you to compassion. That kind of thing ought not to be necessary. We ought to have such scholarships in schools and universities that where there is the ability it should be improved, and the result should be given to the benefit of the people as a whole. In that regard England is a thorough democracy in its education.

In another sense, also, there is a fine idealism about the education of individuals that is in itself ideal. Genuine idealism is shown in picking out and in preparing scholars; and here is another form of it. For long it has been known that the universities of Britain supplied a large number of those who go into public life in Britain. At that Conference, presided over by university men, were Curzon, Balfour, Haldane, Lord Robert Cecil, Lord Kenmore, (Balfour of Burleigh, who was to have presided, died the day before) and one or two others—you had an illustration of this. Britain, through her universities, has supplied the leading statesmen, chancellors of universities, leader after leader for the public life of England, ambassadors and so on, all down through history for the last two centuries at least, and who, among us, will say that that has been a failure? (Hear, hear)

But there is another side to it. From the universities there has gone out another movement in the last twenty-five years—idealism—that is, a movement to educate the worker; and the Workers' Educational Association in Britain has reached very large proportions. That was taken up by young men, scholars of the highest ability who also felt that they had a mission. The same kind of a mission that has sent the minister down into the slums, to find his work in raising the people there, and also has sent out the missionary to foreign parts, has sent this educated academic missionary out among the working people of Britain, with an idealistic purpose—a purpose to educate those people, not with theories, but to make them think, and to make them think as they ought to think, not imposing theories on them, nor saying, "This is the right thing to think, therefore think it," but telling them, "Think, think, and find out what is the right thing to think." That was their attitude—the attitude of freedom and of toleration; and so long as that freedom and that toleration exist in the university there is hope. They went out with that sense of freedom and they carried their message out far and wide through England. And what is the result? That if England has, in the near future, a Labour Government, do you imagine that the English people are going to tremble at the result, and expect that there is to be overturning and overturning? Not at all. The English people will watch that result with the greatest calm and confidence. Why? Because they have educated leaders among the working class such as no other country in the world has. (Loud applause) That has come through the Workers' Educational Association. We are trying to work that here somewhat, but again we are away behind them, whatever the reason may be.

We go to England to learn many things—the idealism of education both for the higher and for the lower, both for the man who is to become Chancellor of the Exchequer and Prime Minister of Britain, and for the man who is to work. It is spreading all through the large bodies of men in Sheffield and Manchester and Birmingham and Newcastle and all over the country.

Then, again, England has been watching her health, very carefully watching her health. I had the good fortune of spending four or five days with Sir George Newman, who is the Medical Health Officer of Great Britain. Those of you who have seen the "Times" would have seen a good deal of criticism of Sir George Newman of late. He is a man of Quaker stock, a very high type of man, first cousin to Lord Lister. Sir George Newman carries science into the Ministry of Health, and is raising the standard of the health of England. Now, he could not say things that perhaps we could say, but I do not think there is any doubt that the general standard of public health in England as determined by sanitary conditions is further on in England by a long way than it is on this continent, and therefore, again, the Old World has not to come to the New to get lessons in the matter of sanitary affairs and of public health. That has gone so far that now there is a good deal of criticism because there has been an invasion of the sanctuary of the individual, and there has been a certain amount of trenching upon the prerogatives of the practitioner. These things touch the Englishman sorely, but still, thank God, the general condition in Britain as far as public health goes is well advanced.

That is about all that I have to say on education, and, if you will allow me, I shall just say a word or two about the other problems, chiefly of an economic nature, and how they affect the life of England. I am not competent to speak upon the economic situation of England; many here know that far better than I do; but generally, as one thought of the situation and heard people talk, the impression was that England will work her way through before long. There may be a great deal of suffering, and there probably will be, this winter. The belt will be buckled in more tightly, and there will be a good deal of shivering, but they will come through. The serious problem in England, to my mind, is not this winter, but it is as follows: Can the English workmen be still given a wage comparable to what he got recently? I must say that personally I hope he can, because if the English workman is not given a higher wage, and a good deal higher wage than he ever had before, then the conditions are such that I do not see how there can be the high degree of vitality maintained in the average English workman that is necessary for England if it is to remain where it is in the lead of the world; and high-wages—reasonably high wages—are in my judgment of immense benefit to the country as a whole, that the home should be full of comfort, that the children should be given a chance, that the man, in his non-working hours, should also have the opportunity of developing himself, and that the general tone and type of the artisan should be so raised that he can regard himself with self-respect, that self-respect which in the long run is the root of contentment. (Applause) The Englishmen know that, and the problem is, can England do it? That is the real problem. Can she compete with the rest of the world, and do it? As I say, it would be impertinent for me to answer this question, but Lord Haldane tells us that she can. He is constantly impressing the value of education in order to do this; he says that if the workmen will only be educated far enough, the country can produce immense quantities of first-class material at such low prices that the markets will become hers and the wages may remain high. (Hear, hear)

The solution of the future, therefore, lies in education and intelligence; and if there is an educated artisan class, a highly intelligent artisan class, fewer and fewer unskilled, then not only will their whole tone of life be higher but they will settle their difficulties in a spirit, as he says, sensibly, amicably and without any talk of revolution. I have the authority, therefore, of a great thinker, to my mind one of the great men of England, who was misjudged in the past—Lord Haldane; he gave one of the greatest addresses at the Conference this last summer on Adult Education. His view is that the English workmen can be so raised by education that he will become a better producer, and by the use of machinery and other devices it will be possible for England to compete with the rest of the world, and to provide for her workmen a fine wage which will give him the opportunity that otherwise he would not have. (Applause)

That, then, is one side. But has not England too many people for her size? I think so; and that is what the Englishman thinks; and therefore surely we overseas must relieve Britain positively by receiving a larger immigration into Canada than we have ever had before. (Applause) Why should not five millions of Englishmen be taken away from their forty-five, and put into our country? (Hear, hear) Now, I do not say that it is possible to do that this winter, with all our troubles, but there is such a thing as setting your face in the right direction, and saying at the earliest possible moment we will see that this immigration comes, and comes under such direction that it is not all dumped in one place. Let us cut the channels for it, so that the stream, like good irrigation, is taken where it should go—a real policy of immigration looking over a period of years, to create in this land of ours another great centre for the English-speaking world. (Loud applause) That is the idea; and if we do not do that we cannot long keep our rich lands unfilled. Neither justice nor humanity will allow it. We cannot keep those to ourselves; the rest of the world will press in. Now, the rest of the world has many people that we would welcome, and it would be very narrow of us to say that we will have nothing to do with the rest of the world; but we who know the virtues of our own stock do believe that those vacant lands should be taken up by the people whom we know and whom we can assimilate best. That is really what we should do. (Hear, hear)

England, by its process of education, is seriously considering how it can raise the standard of the working class, but what about the upper class? Last week in the United States I was spoken to by an American who said, "Surely there is a great social revolution in England, and the rich people are losing their lands, and they will be tremendously upset." I replied, "Don't believe it; no upset; the rich people do not make England; the people at the top who have immense estates do not make England; they have their share, but it is not a very big share. Anyway, all I can see is a curtailment not a disappearance, and possibly a little curtailing would be good for them and somebody else." "What about the *nouveaux riches?*" "There may be a few of them, but the few who have money have not a great deal of influence. However, the *nouveaux riches* who are talked about are like the old families of England who were talked about as *nouveaux riches* not very long ago; so don't talk about the *nouveaux riches,* there will be no revolution there." England does not depend on them. But there is a great class that is feeling the economic pressure, and that is the middle class and the upper middle class; they are feeling it very much, and they are the ones who have in the past been the security of British civilization with their education, their refinement, their character, and their idealism; and if that class should suffer, then surely England would suffer. But if that class can be maintained—not that they should live in the comfort they enjoyed before and possibly send their boys to the schools that they themselves went to, but that they should be in a position to maintain their idealistic standards—if that class is maintained, and the working class is brought back, there is no fear about Britain. As you know, times come in every man's life when he realizes that life does not consist in the things that a man possesses. It comes to everyone who thinks, to realize that culture does not thrive so much upon opulence as it does upon moderation. Vulgarity—or display, rather—is a thing that does not know how to express itself otherwise, but the spirit of art, of science, of literature, of religion, can only find expression in a spiritual knowledge that is understood by those who are spiritually minded; and the spiritual forces do not attract to themselves power through vulgar display or through being decked out by the things that wealth gives; not at all. The charm of culture is in the mind; it is in the tone of speech, it is in the temper, it is in the bearing; it is not in the outward trappings; and the outward trappings of that middle class in England, such as they have had in the days of their comparative ease, may be less than they have been before, but provided that the things of the spirit remain as they were—and I have seen no sign that they are diminished—then the power of those people will remain also. (Loud applause)

And finally, there is this: England in the past has never shown to such advantage as when she had her back to the wall, and now when that class, and the working class too—I do not know so much about the other classes—but when those two great classes have their backs to the wall, I believe that England will face her problems as never before. Necessity will drive her to do things that she never did before. Ingenuity will awake. Dormant geniuses will be called out by the need for them. The will will be addressed; things will be tackled; and there will be a moral result that, I believe will astonish us. In fact, as I see it, the danger is not in

Britain; the danger is on this continent more, caused by the very ease with which we make our wealth, and take our material standards to guide us, not only here but across the line. If we think of comfort as producing the highest type of manhood, so sure as we do, our spiritual power will lessen, our spiritual faculty will be atrophied, our spiritual speech will be degraded, and we shall talk in materialistic language which will really be a sign of decay rather than of power.

We should go to England to learn many things to-day, and certainly we should not return, if you come back as I did, in any way pessimistic. (Loud applause)

PRESIDENT MITCHELL requested Mr. Hopkins to express the thanks of the Club to the speaker.

MR. J. CASTELL HOPKINS

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—It is always a privilege to express the thanks of this Club to anyone of the distinguished gentlemen who from time to time address us. It is one of the greatest and deepest values of this and similar clubs in Canada that it presents opportunity for men of light and leading to give to the people of their city, and through the press to the people of the country, messages which may help the people in their lines of development, in their thoughts and aspirations. No man is more capable of giving such a message to the people of Canada than Sir Robert Falconer. (Hear, hear and applause) The interesting, illuminative and eloquent address to which we have listened is a confirmation of that fact. Sir Robert has described present conditions in England most accurately. I was in England myself about a year ago. I had the privilege of meeting many of our public men in that country. Their thoughts were not pessimistic; their feelings were appreciative of the intense and many difficulties which they had to meet, but they were optimistic as to the absolute characteristics and qualities of the English people. Mr. Bonar Law, that great Canadian who has made a stamp in English life much more important, much more impressive than our Canadian people realize, told me in a long conversation which I had the privilege of having with him that the most vital fact of that particular time, and of to-day indeed, except perhaps the Irish problem, was that the workman of England is sound at heart. He is often misled; the men who appear on the checker-board of the world's despatches and cable news, the men whose names thus appear to us as representative of the views of the masses of English workmen, are not truly representative, according to this leader, who knows the public life of England. The extremists in labour, the extremists in socialism, the extremists in other lines, are the only danger to the peaceful and harmonious working of our constitution; and we have developed in England the men who really, in the final analysis, represent the working people of England. This was Mr. Bonar Law's principal thought expressed to me, and a thought which it is worth while repeating on this occasion. As to education, I cannot of course say more than what we know—that the men who lead the educational life of England are the men who also embody the intellectual thought of the English-speaking world; and if, in meeting them, Sir Robert comes back to us laden with a message of optimism, laden with a profound belief in the broadness of view of the English people, I say that is a message of importance to our people and a message of intense interest to ourselves. In these days of deep degradation of the intellectual life of whole countries such as Russia it is pleasant to know that in the country which, after all, dominates the thought of the world, the people are educationally capable of rising to the level of their great possibilities and of their great necessities. I am glad indeed to have the privilege of moving this vote of thanks to Sir Robert. (Loud applause)

THE EGYPTIAN AND ARABIAN PROBLEMS

AN ADDRESS BY SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, D.D., LL.D., F.R.G.S.

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Nov. 3, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: *My Lord and Gentlemen,*—We are to-day honoured by having Dr. Zwemer to speak to us on the problems of Egypt and Arabia, particularly as they relate to the British Empire and are conditioned by the Mohammedan faith. I have much pleasure indeed in calling upon Dr. Zwemer.

DR. ZWEMER

Gentlemen,—To quote from an old reading book, "The atrocious crime of being not a British subject I will neither attempt to palliate nor deny." (Laughter) As far as possible by the limitations of American birth and environment I have identified my life with the life of the British Empire in that the better-half of my life became mine at Baghdad twenty-five years ago, when a British lady joined me for life service in the Persian Gulf (applause); and for over thirty years I have lived happily under the British flag and carried on work as a mission-

---

Samuel M. Zwemer, D.D., LL.D., F.R.G.S., is a missionary of the Reformed Church in America. He lived from 1891 to 1906 in Arabia, travelled extensively in the East, and is an international authority on topics pertaining to Mohammedanism. He is director of the "Nile Mission Press," editor of "The Moslem World," an outstanding missionary statesman, and an eloquent speaker.

ary in Arabia and in Egypt. I count myself fortunate to-day speaking of those two countries—Egypt and Arabia—in their relation to the strength and influence of the British Empire; because I believe the map behind me shows at a glance that those two countries are so located that, strategically, and therefore historically and politically, they lie at the very heart of the Empire, and bind together its far-distant possessions and dominions in the Far East to those further west in Nigeria and Canada.

It has been my great pleasure during the years of missionary service to have met personally some of the great builders of the British Empire, namely Lord Curzon, in the Gulf; Lord Kitchener, in Egypt; Sir Reginald Wingate, in the Sudan; and Lord Allenby while I was at work for the Y. M. C. A. in Egypt during the period of the war. It was Lord Allenby who, in one of our meetings of the committee in Cairo, paid a high tribute to the work of the Y.M.C.A. He spoke of this work in terms which I quote on this occasion, because we are here through the invitation of the Y.M.C.A., and under their auspices I have come to Toronto. Lord Allenby stated that: "A broad-minded Christianity, a self-regardless devotion to work, a spirit of daring enterprise, and sound business guidance, have built up in the Y.M.C.A. an organization which has earned the gratitude of the Empire." (Applause)

I realize, Gentlemen, the difficulty of speaking on these two countries, which to-day are still under the mist and shadow of the smoke of battle, and where men's hearts are failing them for fear, not knowing the future.

Now, these two countries—Arabia and Egypt—are first of all closely related in geography because of their proximity, and yet distinguished by their great diversity. Arabia has an area of over a million square miles. It has 4,000 miles of coast, and yet the population of that vast area is probably less than three and a-half, at the most four millions. The provinces are not marked on this small map, but they are generally known as Hadramaut on the south, Hejaz, the kingdom of Mecca, on the west coast, Nejd in the centre, and then Hassa on the east, with Oman on the south-east, and on the far north the Jezireh country, which is no man's land, between Mesopotamia and Syria. The whole of that land is largely desert, with rock-built cities—Mecca, Medina, Damascus, Baghdad, and Busrah on the north. Between the great stretches of Arabian desert, we have the fair oases that make it a land of beauty and charm to all those who have visited it. I always think of those lines of Bayard Taylor describing Arabia itself, when he said:

> Next to Thee, O fair gazelle,
> A Bedouin girl, beloved so well;
> Next to ye both I love the palm
> Whose glittering shadows wrap us three
> With love and silence and mystery.

Arabia flourishes on the date palm, and even the growth and culture of the pearl industry are subsidiary to that original industry of the desert—the cultivation of the date palm. All the way from the head of the Persian Gulf to Baghdad, for five hundred miles as steamers sail, you pass these great date orchards, and the export of the date is one of the chief industries of Mesopotamia, controlled for many years by British and American merchants.

Arabia, perhaps, has a large economic future, but Arabia still remains to be discovered. We have better maps of the North Pole and of the moon than we have of South Eastern Arabia for the obvious reason that more money, by far, has been spent in exploring the north polar regions, and on telescopes for exploring the moon, than has ever been spent by any geographical society for the exploration of Arabia. Yet throughout the war period brave people like Captain Shakespeare and Colonel Philby, Miss Gertrude Bell, and especially Colonel Lawrence have re-discovered that unknown country, and we have to-day a new hand-book, published by the Admiralty, giving a complete geography of the whole Peninsula, and maps on a fairly large scale of practically every one of the provinces; and this rediscovery was possible, most of all, through the splendid efforts of the men who served the British Empire. (Applause)

Egypt is a country whose history and whose geography is known to the last square mile or quarter of a mile, because of its intense cultivation. On the map, Egypt has an area of 400,000 square miles, but the actual Egypt, the Egypt of practical politics and economics, has an area of only 12,976 square miles. Egypt on the map is ten times as large as Ohio, but Egypt of actual administration and population is smaller than the State of Vermont. Yet, crowded in that narrow area, running for a thousand miles up the Nile, sometimes only a mile or two wide, and at the Delta only 100 or 150 miles wide, there is crowded a population of not less than 12,500,000 souls.

It has three layers of civilization. It is really the palimpsest of history. First there is the old Egyptian civilization of the Pharaohs. Over that, the Christian civilization of the Greco-Roman period, and then for 1300 years, writ large, the third civilization of Mohammedanism. Any one of us could refresh our memory on those three great periods by reading again three remarkable novels that deal with each period respectively—Ebers' "Bride of the Nile", Kingsley's "Hypatia", and either Burton's or Lane's translation of the "Arabian Nights". And the strange thing is that in "Hypatia" or in the "Bride of the Nile" or in the "Stories of the Arabian Nights" the same characteristics stand out—the old Egypt has never changed. The fanatic priest, the sensual masses, and the environment and background have practically remained the same, so that superstition and art and architecture can be traced all through those three layers, and you find a marvellous similarity in the life of Egypt.

In their relations with the British Empire, Arabia and Egypt have had a history, especially during the last hundred years. British ships, and afterwards British gunboats, explored the coasts of Arabia from Aden to Maskat, and from Maskat all the way to Busrah. The hydrographic charts used to-day by all the powers were prepared in those early days by Captain Constable and others, and you will find on the corner of all the charts of the Indian Ocean the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, the witness of that early exploration which mapped out the highways of the Near East.

Great Britain also has won her right to the coasts of Arabia by the suppression of piracy. All the east coast of Arabia, especially the south east coast of Oman, once consisted of pirate nests until the British Navy made the Arabs behave themselves as regards British commerce and trade. The treaties made between the Indian Government and the peoples on the south coast and the east coast of Arabia were the beginning of economic progress and the beginning of real civilization for all that part of the world. That history has not yet been told. A Frenchman has just written a book on the Persian Gulf in which he pays a high tribute to the civilizing influence of British Navy efforts in those early days which followed the history of the Portuguese East India Companies and the Dutch East India Companies.

Then Great Britain has suppressed the slave trade, and thus has brought great blessing to the East coast of Arabia. I was present when Lord Curzon, as Viceroy of India, made his famous tour from Bombay to Maskat, and from Maskat to all the ports of the Persian Gulf, and finally to Busrah, Nejo, and on to Baghdad. It was then that he made his famous statement regarding the special rights of the Empire in the waters of the Persian Gulf, to the effect that any power attempting to find a centre there in opposition to the British Empire would be challenged. Referring to this in one of my books I spoke of the Persian Gulf as having become a British lake, because I think that, for all practical purposes, the only flag, the only authority, the only survey, the only lighthouses, the only commercial development in the Persian Gulf is British. (Applause)

Now, as to the political map of Arabia; the political connections of Great Britain with Arabia were not only in the Persian Gulf. She never annexed a port in all those years; she simply patrolled the seas; not a single place was marked British on the map. The first place in all Arabia to become British was Aden, which was annexed to the Empire in 1837, the year of Queen Victoria's accession to the throne. So, for over a hundred years the Persian Gulf has been a part of the British Empire by exploration, by hydrographic charts, by the suppression of piracy and the slave trade; and since 1837 the Aden protectorate has been one of the great foci of that vast ellipse which covers British trade and British enterprise in the Near East.

The political map of Arabia in 1914, that is, before the war, would have been something as follows: The Province of Hejaz running along the coast almost as far as Mecca was under the government of Turkey, and thus was part of the Turkish Empire, also the Province of Hassa and the vilayets of Baghdad and Busrah. Except for those two strips of territory along the east and west coast, the whole of Arabia had not paid tribute or owned the power of Turkey for many centuries. They tried to hold Yemen, but the Arabs were always in rebellion, and the British protectorate gradually extended its power all along this coast and across to Hadramaut.

When the war broke out the Arabs revolted, and the revolt was not first at Mecca and in the Province of Hejaz, for before the end of 1914 the Turks had been turned out of all East Arabia. Busrah and Baghdad, still held out until the British troops took that country in the war. When, as you know, Colonel Lawrence was sent to promote negotiations with the Hejaz king, and with his sons, the Shieks of Mecca, including Faisul, the result was that the Hejaz kingdom became one of the allies on the side of Great Britain and France in the great world war. I suppose it is unnecessary to speak of the details of that alliance. The magazines have made us quite familiar with the brilliant character of the work done by Colonel Lawrence. They have also indicated that he used not only diplomacy and his keen knowledge of the Arab mind and the Arab heart, but that he was enabled to persuade many tribes by the use of gold to cast in their lot with the allies. The result of that policy remains yet to be seen. It is always dangerous to employ mercenary troops and the Arab who knew how to get gold now knows how to ask for more. Conditions politically are still very unsettled.

During the war there was a great revival of Mohammedanism in East Arabia, in the territory of Nejd. The Ikwan movement, "the Brethren", is a revival of the old Wahabi spirit which arose in Arabia at the beginning of the nineteenth century, which then spread to India and North Africa in the Senoussi order. Now, this revival movement of "the Brethren" has spread all over East Arabia until practically from the confines of Nejo and Busrah the whole interior up to the walls of Mecca sweeping south, is held by those Puritan Mohammedans —filled with the old Mohammedan spirit of intolerance and fanaticism. What the future of that movement holds, nobody can tell.

The British have, of course, since the occupation of Busrah and Baghdad, made this an Arabian Kingdom or an Arabian protectorate under King Faisul, who, we are told, is now welcomed at Baghdad as the ruler of the new province of Irak. Oman is practically a British protectorate, with a Sultan at Maskat. The tribes of Hadramaut and the tribes along the Oman littoral are all closely bound to the British by treaty. Aden is a British protectorate. So, for all practical purposes, except for the indigenous movement which is religious in character, the whole of Arabia has only one dominant power, and that is Great Britain. For better or for worse these million square miles of territory from Baghdad all the way to Aden can at present expect no sovereignty and no foreign domination except it be the power and influence or diplomacy of the British Empire. If the Arabs need a friendly ally could they find any better?

When we come to Egypt the story is too well known to need repetition. I suppose the first actual political power exercised by Britain in Egypt was after the bombardment of Alexandria and the occupation in 1880, although long before that Great Britain claimed her share, in the Suez Canal, which I think can best be designated as the jugular vein of the British Empire. It unites the two extremes of Empire—the far-off country of Australia, India, Singapore and the Malay Strait Settlements. All this vast population, including also the City of Hongkong, through one narrow gateway, with the British Isles and Greater Britain across the Seas. Now, that narrow gateway, the Suez Canal, is undoubtedly the most strategic place of the whole British Empire. To be wounded there is to suffer a death blow. To lose that is to lose everything as far as the connection and bond of Empire goes; and so to the outsider it seems almost logical that the occupation of 1880 should have been continued and should have been emphasized and become a protectorate during the war. It also seems almost obvious that the strength of the enemies of the allied powers, Germany, Turkey and the Central powers, should have been thrown with extreme violence into that particular sector of the great battle line, namely, the Suez Canal. It was along that Canal and in Egypt that we learned to know the representatives of the Empire that came to defend the Empire and flocked from every quarter of the earth to Egypt like doves to their windows.

There we met men from Jamaica and the West Indies. fighting for Great Britain; men from South Africa; from Hongkong; from every part of India; your Canadian units, some of them also came right to that great centre; and there, finally, the Canal was not only defended, but a railway was laid, and the water pipes connecting the Nile with the Jordan were completed, until on the great battlefield of Armageddon, Lord Allenby, with the armies of every part of the Empire represented, had his signal victory over Turkey, which was the deathknell of Turkish power, as we believe, in that part of the world. (Applause)

Now, you ask me as an American, was the long continued occupation of Egypt justified? I speak not as a politician; I speak as a man who looks upon Egypt as one of the great portions of the world that has not been favoured as we have and that therefore merits at the hand of humanity economic progress, social uplift, and spiritual blessings. I believe that Lord Cromer's famous book on Egypt, or Lord Milner's book, or the reports from year to year that came from the hand of the great Empire-builders abundantly justify the occupation in the evidence they laid before the world. (Applause) Great Britain raised Egypt from bankruptcy to financial stability. She changed Egypt from a land of dire poverty to one of astonishing economic prosperity. I have spoken with farmers whose land was worth $40 an acre in the Delta before the British occupation; since the British occupation you cannot buy that land for $250 or $300 an acre. The population has increased enormously. The Turkish system of bribery and corruption—which is not peculiar to Turkey (laughter)—rather the Oriental system of bribery and corruption has been practically abolished, and you will find everywhere, to the smallest village of Egypt, a British system of common justice based on common law, and so administered with very few exceptions that whether you spoke to the carriage driver on the streets of Cairo or the poor fellaheen in the villages before the war, they all admitted that the scales of justice hung even, and that British equity was not a byword, but a reality. There is also religious liberty.

Now, as far as regards education, I think in a measure we may with justice criticise the British policy. One of the Mohammedan papers put it all in a sentence. It said, "quoting from the words of your Saviour, 'Man shall not live by bread alone.' Man shall not live by irrigation alone, but by education." And the educational policy of Great Britain in the Nile valley has not been up to the ideals of other Anglo-Saxon powers, as, for example, the American policy in the Philippine Islands. Otherwise, how would it be possible that the last census of Egypt should actually tell us that illiteracy among the women and girls of Egypt is still over ninety-nine per cent? Three women out of a thousand can read and write their own names in the Nile valley! And the illiteracy of the male population still remains over ninety per cent, varying a little according to the location of the provinces.

In the second place, education was not only neglected on a large scale, but the type of education was sadly inopportune, and not fitted to produce the principles of democracy of self-rule and self-determination from an intelligent standpoint in that great section of the world. The education produced annually a large crop, a super-crop, of government clerks and men who desired government positions; whereas the country, being agricultural, and in need of engineers for irrigation, and the scientific production of new crops, and the rotation of crops, should have had a type of education such, for example, as we have across the border in the Tuskegee Institute, or the Hampton Institute of our Southern States—an education which dignifies labour, which produces men with technical knowledge for the every-day walk of life, and not merely men who are ambitious and eager to have a part in the government of the country.

Now, aside from these mistakes—which I believe were mistakes—ever since the occupation of the country influences have been at work to undermine British prestige. They were many; they were often from surprising quarters. Just before the war those influences, whatever may have been their motive, were directed by Germany, and a system of propaganda, the systematic undermining of British authority, became very active during the whole war period. Egypt was honeycombed with spies and agencies that were against all that Great Britain had done for Egypt. The Nationalist movement which arose to fury after the Armistice was simply one of the fruits of this programme. When Germany willed the war she also planned a Pan-Islamic rising. In 1907 the German traveller, Karl Peters, wrote these words in one of the German reviews:—"In case of a world war, if German policy is only bold enough she will be able, through Pan-Islamism, to fashion the dynamite which will blow to atoms British and French rule from Morocco to Calcutta." When I read those astonishing words; I quoted them in my book entitled, "Islam, a Challenge to Faith", in the chapter on the Political conditions of the Moslem World. My book was published in 1908 or 1909, and yet I never realized that here, in a missionary text-book, was the actual programme which was being followed by those who had far larger influence than Karl Peters. When this programme of universal propagandism among the Mohammedans against France and Great Britain failed, and the Holy War proved a fiasco, the dynamite that had been laid in Singapore, in India, in North India, in Afghanistan, in Egypt—when it did not go off at the proper moment, remained, like hidden mines that in some parts of the world are still a constant peril to political navigation. In my opinion the Nationalist uprising, although it had economic causes and educational grievances, and was in some respects a natural response to the watchwords of the programme of self-determination at Paris, and was a recoil due to the sense of injustice because Arabia was represented at the Council of Versailles, while Egypt was not; nevertheless the great motive in this revolt and attempt at revolution was due to ouside propagandism and Mohammedan intolerance rather than any just cause of not having "life or liberty and the pursuit of happiness" under the British flag. (Hear, hear)

Perhaps the best statement of the present situation is that given a few weeks ago, in an article in The *Nation.* I quote the words:— "The only official statement of British policy that I know of is Lord Allenby's assertion that whatever the government granted to Egypt it will be in the direction of increasing self-government for the Egyptians. That is a wise formula, for sudden and complete independence would find Egypt ill-equipped to manage herself. It would put in power the land-owning and city professional classes who have had little experience in government, and might conceivably bring about chaos in a few years' time. I think that the evidence of Britain's good intentions towards Egypt would be found not in a sudden dramatic withdrawal, but in a deliberate, gradual and honest withdrawal from Egyptian affairs. . . .

She could in this interval undo some of the wrong committed against the peasants, and fortify their position in the commonwealth. She could, and of course she would, protect what she considers the essential interests of the Empire and of foreigners by measures similar to those contemplated in the Milner memorandum. This would offer a good chance to permanent peace and prosperity for all who are concerned." I believe this is a moderate expression of the views of outsiders regarding their desire as to Britain's future policy in the Nile valley.

Lastly, I would speak of the solidarity of Arabia and Egypt in their future interests because they are knit together by a common faith. No one can understand the Eastern question who refuses to investigate and therefore fails to understand that which lies deepest and most fundamental in the Eastern mind, namely, the Mohammedan faith. There are four things that bind men together in daily life—a common faith, a common hope, a common task and a common peril. Now, those four have simply knit together, as with bands of steel, 200,000,000 people stretching from Morocco to the western provinces of China, and from Central Asia to Zanzibar. I refer to the common faith of Mohammed, to a common hope of a future kingdom of Islam, the common task of Moslem propagandism among pagan tribes, and, lastly, the common peril that faces every thinking Moslem whether it be in America or Singapore or Calcutta—the peril of Western civilization which undermines all its old institutions, slave-trade, polygamy, Moslem law, and the peril, which to them is also a real one, of Christian propagandism through hospitals, schools, preaching, Bible distribution, and Y.M.C.A. work.

The centres of that religion are principally three, great cities. Mecca is the heart; Cairo is the brain; and Constantinople is the strong arm of Islam; This they have been for at least five hundred years, not to go further back in history. Now, if you will realize that Mecca is to-day practically governed by a king appointed by the British Empire; that Cairo, the centre of Moslem journalism, education, and their great university, is under the British flag, and that necessarily and for their own good the censorship controls the Moslem press; and that the fleet of the allies, especially that of Great Britain, is guarding not only the Dardanelles but controls the issues at Constantinople, you can put yourself in the place of the Mohammedan. This is why the Egyptian and the Arab, the Persian and the Afghan, the Punjaubi and the Bengali and the Moplas of South India, can only feel that this world-war has shaken the foundations of their faith. They are disillusioned, disappointed and distracted by the wide-reaching issues of a world-war which many of them never willed, but of which they were the unwilling victims.

The bulk of the people are Moslems, all are also Orientals; and they are Orientals in Arabia and Egypt who belong to the desert—a special type of civilization—for Arabia is a desert with oases, and Egypt is a desert with one long oasis, the Nile valley. The type of architecture, the type of home, is the same everywhere; and when you scratch the surface you find in the *effendis* and the *fellahin,* between the Arab of the desert and the Arab of the town, similar characteristics. I believe I am fair towards these people because I love them; I expect to go back and work among them—and yet their characteristics are not easy for us of the West to understand. They are distinguished, because of illiteracy, and much superstition. In the second place, they possess marvellous politeness and hospitality, and in these two graces, in those two great gifts of the Spirit of God, they excel the Christian world. They are distinguished also for cheerfulness and patience—not the patience of perseverance, for that they have not, but the patience of endurance. I have often been put to shame when travelling with Arabs, working with Arabs, suffering with Arabs, hungry, cold, naked, beholding this cheerfulness and patient endurance of hard things because they came from Allah. from God—why should not they be accepted without any murmur! On the other hand, they are distinguished also for utter conservatism, for unwillingness to change the path of the fathers, whether it be a pathway running through the forest or through the deserts, or a pathway running through their own minds and hearts. They have also a fierce religiousness. Our religion seems cold and indifferent to the Arab and Egyptian mind. In "Hypatia", in the "Bride of the Nile", and the "Arabian Nights" you can read it—how those men, when they say their creed whatever the words may be not only say it, but shout it. Within them there are only two great personalities to be considered, self and God; and everything is interpreted under the constant realism of this strong theism.

For example, recently I happened to purchase a copy of the *New York Times,* one of our best American dailies It was the Saturday morning edition. I think it had thirty-two pages, including advertising. I also had with me a copy of the Mecca Daily called *"El Kibla"*. In the Mecca daily I found the word"Allah"—God—almost in every paragraph, surely in every column. He had His place in the programme of the world events, and their interpretation. After looking through that Saturday number of the *Times* I did not find the word "God" except two references in the list of subjects for Sunday services, and once the word "Jesus Christ". And what is true of the newspapers is true of daily life. Their religiousness is always to the front; ours is often only in our sub-consciousness. An English boy would be ashamed to be caught praying; a Mohammedan boy would be ashamed to be caught not praying at the proper hour; and in that statement you have the difference.

Now, what is to be the future of these two great nationalities in the British Empire?—because undoubtedly the responsibility for Arabia, the responsibility for Egypt, rests on no one's shoulders, so much as on the shoulders of the British Empire. What is the future of those two countries looked at from the standpoint of the outsider? One can be a pessimist and follow Omar Kahyyam, or be an optimist and follow Isaiah. There is the answer. If it is all "a checkerboard of nights and days", then perchance one government will succeed another, and chaos and night may follow dawn. But, if we believe, as most of us here do, that God is at the helm of the world, that the war did not happen by chance that even the wrath of man praises Him, that, as Tennyson puts it, choosing the words almost in words of Scripture, there "is one far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves", then, Gentlemen, I believe I can carry you with me when I say that we missionaries are following that programme, (and do it gladly under the British flag,) and propose to open in all those countries centres of Christian influence and education and life and light and uplift until the kingdoms of Mohammed shall have become part of the great and glorious kingdom of Jesus Christ and of His Church.

There are forces on the map of the world that are not visible. There are forces not advertised in the newspaper press. Can you estimate the power, for example, of the Christian leadership at Beyrout, with its university of 1000 students going out into all this region? Every newspaper editor of Egypt was trained in Beyrout College. Can you imagine the influence of one hospital, and that noble Scotchman, Doctor John C. Young, at Aden, where for thirty-three years he has been treating some 30,000 Arab patients a year? Can you estimate the influence of forty hospitals like that on the map of the Near East, hospitals in the Persian Gulf and in the great cities of Egypt? And American mission schools all the way from Alexandria and Cairo to Khartoum and far beyond into the upper reaches of Abyssinia?

In the building of an empire you cannot afford to neglect those spiritual forces which have been introduced by British subjects and by American citizens as the hope of humanity long before Great Britain occupied any portion of Egypt or established herself in any part of the Persian Gulf. May those great forces be increased and multiplied. The reconciliation of races and classes made possible in the Y.M.C.A. huts or the Red Cross hospitals during the war will prove possible also in peace to bring together alien races. The Christian message of love and fellowship and equality and forgiveness and education, the uplift of womanhood, the rights of childhood, shall spread themselves over all these regions. If ever the day comes when you receive missionary reports of the Cathedral Church not of Uganda but of Hejaz, and when we have bishoprics or presbyteries again in Arabia as there were before Mohammed declared himself an apostle of God, then those bishops and preachers and missionaries and leaders in education will perchance look up and see the Cross of St. Andrew, the Cross of St. Patrick and the Cross of St. George on the same old flag. It will still be the flag that has the most respect and is the most feared and loved of any banner in Arabia or Egypt by the peoples that shall live in independence under its folds as somehow a part of the Empire. (Applause)

PRESIDENT MITCHELL asked Mr. Warburton to express the thanks of the Club to the speaker of the day.

MR. WARBURTON said: As a guest of your Club to-day I wish, first of all, to pay my tribute to the Club itself because of the breadth of its programme and the sagacity which it shows in bringing before representative men of this community these great questions of the Empire. I am permitted to speak for you as well as for your guests to-day in moving a vote of thanks to the speaker. I frankly confess that not very often have I heard such a combination of instruction and inspiration as we have listened to to-day. Mr. President, it seems to me that nothing is needed in Canada to-day more than that the Canadian people should realize that we are a part of the British Empire, and that we are vitally concerned with Oriental questions. (Applause) We have had altogether too narrow a view with respect to our own obligations and with respect to our own relations; and it strikes me that this Washington conference that is to be held will have as important a bearing upon the history of Canada as it will upon the history of any part of the British Empire and therefore anything that leads us to lift up our eyes, to rid ourselves of narrowness and smallness, and to help us to think in terms of the whole world, and especially to fix our eyes upon Asia as the future danger spot in the history of the world, is something for which we ought to be thankful. On that account, as well as because of the very happy spirit in which we have been addressed to-day—the wonderful felicity of phrase, the abundance of information that has been given us—I move a vote of thanks to the speaker of the day.

The motion was carried amid loud applause, the audience rising and giving three cheers.

STORY OF LABRADOR MEDICAL MISSION

AN ADDRESS BY WILLIAM T. GRENFELL,
C.M.G., M.D., M.R.C.S., LL.D.

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, November 17, 1921.

PRESIDENT MITCHELL,—To-day we have the honour of welcoming Dr. Grenfell who will speak to us about his home, the Labrador, which he has brought very close to us, by his work. I am sure we all realize that, however far away Labrador seems, it is an integral part of Canada; and is the first piece of Canada one sees in coming from the Old Country in the summer. A few minutes ago, in order to satisfy my own curiosity, I asked Dr. Grenfell why it was that Labrador was usually called "the Labrador", and he said he thought it was the result of the old sailing days, when the old sailor himself shortened the term "the Labrador Coast" to "the Labrador"; and so, in speaking of it as "the Labrador", I want to introduce to you "the Grenfell". (Applause)

DR. GRENFELL

General Mitchell and Gentlemen,—You don't know how small a man feels when he comes straight from the wild lands of Labrador to these elaborate buildings and faces men who are driving the commerce of this enormous city. I only rode in last night, having come straight up from the Coast by the "Manoa", which is the new service that has been inaugurated this last year between Labrador and the mainland, which I think is going to pay, and going to do a great deal of good. One cannot help feeling, when one sees these rows of electric lights, these enormous factories, and these crowds of human beings, that one is going to be asked, "Why don't you move up out of Labrador and come and live up here?" A great many do. Unquestionably a great many Newfoundlanders leave the country and come to Toronto, and no doubt there are a number of those meeting here, because of the contributions of cities, the conventionalities which men like, and many of the things that have become almost essential to human happiness—at least, so we think. But I want you to understand that I am an extreme optimist, and that though it is not always easy to demonstrate the future value of any particular action, and much less of any particular country, I have a vision in my mind, and have always had—and I have been thirty years on the Coast—that some day you will be a great deal prouder of Labrador and the surroundings than perhaps we are to-day. (Applause)

Now, it takes a very long time for any man to work out his own vision of how he is to introduce a better condition of things; and it is exactly thirty years since I landed there in a sailing boat from England. I was a young surgeon, and my idea was that my contribution to life should be through the healing of the human machine; but long experience on that Coast has brought to my mind the fact that very often the human machine is not worth improving, after all. I have seen many a patient come to my operating table when it was exceedingly questionable whether it was advantageous to prolong his existence, and whether, for general purposes, it would not have been better to shorten it. Therefore I have learned that the practical contribution of any one human being is not limited to the immediate part or craft that he is to specialize on.

Before I begin to speak of Newfoundland and Labrador I want you to understand that I have lived there thirty years, and my family was born there, and I do not want to say anything that may be in the slightest derogatory to Newfoundland or Labrador, which are not in the advanced condition yet that you are in Canada. While I have lived there under the autonomous government that rules it, I am an ardent federationist, and I believe that long ago we ought to have come into federation with this country. (Applause) We have to come, if you will take us, a little later on; that I am pretty sure of, though I am not here to discuss political questions, because that is one thing I am not—a politician. In the North where we live, we are pretty well separated, divorced from the difficulties that beset men who are supposed to arrange for all our big problems, and we just forge ahead in our own way. All the same, I am absolutely convinced, and I think every right-thinking man is, that we shall never be in our right place until we are federated with this country. I have seen, during these last many years, the tide coming down our way. Canadian commerce has been pushing its way down the Gulf, and whereas, when I went there thirty years ago, there was not a single worth-while lumber or timber proposition, you might say, between Quebec and 900 miles of our Coast to the Eastern seaboard, yet to-day there are quite a number, and they are all the time pushing towards us. The shores of Labrador not only have rich fisheries, but it has valuable assets in its trees and its water-powers.

Now, you may think that I am trying to "boost" the country, but I have no wish to "boost" at all, or to knock it, but I would speak about it as I see it. There is no question that the explorations of these last few years have shown that there are sufficient assets in timber to make it certain that within a short number of years we shall have, quite up to the Atlantic seaboard, timber and paper projects working, much as you have up here. I remember a few years ago when the Abitibi and Iroquois Falls proposition was being undertaken, that they sent down to me to send them up a hundred men because they thought it was a very cold proposition there; and I remember our men coming back, a number of them, and they said it was too jolly cold up there, it was much warmer down our way. (Laughter) However, you know what a splendid thing that proposition has become, and so it has at Chicoutimi and at St. Augustine and St. Louis Bay, as it will even further north, when the tide of commerce runs as it was doing before the war in full strength, and the needs for those things are more apparent.

People often say to me, "Well, if there is distress and need for help on a coast like that, why don't you come to places where there is no need?" Well, there is no such place. There is no place in the world to-day where there is not some poverty, where there is not sometimes unemployment; and I myself believe that there need be no time in a great country like that where there need be any unemployment; and along those lines I am going to speak a word or two.

First of all, of course, our fish is our real asset. When the cod rush in on the shore in the spring of the year, it sounds like a fish story to say that you can hardly sail through them; but I have often seen the sea so thick with codfish that they almost bring your boat to a standstill. Now, people have said that the codfishing is declining, and there is not as much caught as used to be. That is not so; there is as much caught to-day as there ever was. This year we have had very fine fishing, and we have got nearly every schooner loaded, and only one or two places had any scarcity of fish. But, of course, the war has had a very serious effect on that industry, because, unfortunately, we still put up our fish in the antediluvian fashion that we have always had—just plain salting it and drying it. It is easier to handle and get rid of in that way, and then it becomes the food of the poor; but well-off people do not eat much of our salt fish. When I got aboard the "Manoa" a few days ago, it was a pitiable thing to see this large steamer coming back from our little colony almost empty, though they picked up a few barrels of oil and a few potatoes at Prince Edward Island. All the trade in the way of flour and produce, etc., has to go down to Newfoundland, where of course there is a very large market for the produce. But that has told against us in the war because, fish being a food for the poor, and being very oddly a desirable kind of food in tropical climates where you have great heat and dryness, that kind of fish seems to be much more stimulating than other forms of food. I have often had that from men who could afford other things, and yet have found that to be a fact. The Greeks and the Italians, South America, and the West Indies, above all the shores of the Mediterranean are our markets. These people simply cannot pay to-day the price that it costs us to catch our fish. We still have to pay high prices for twine, paint, canvas, and the things that we are obliged to use to get our fish, and especially for salt; and this year we find that the foreign markets cannot pay our prices.

Those of you that follow the story of Newfoundland know that last year their Government tried to put up prices on our staple product, fish, by interference with the ordinary economic laws, in one of those efforts that have always failed. Some of us are familiar with the attempt of Roman Emperors like Diocletian to fix the price of everything, from salt water fish to the writing of a letter, or from an advocate's fee to the price of a cabbage, and then if people did not sell and buy at the prices he made they were crucified for it; if they paid too high they were killed, and if they sold too high they were killed—it didn't matter which. As one goes through history and reads of the attempts to fix prices he sees what an awful failure it has been. However, they did try that in Newfoundland last year; and we were not allowed to sell in the Mediterranean under a certain price, which had to be put up before the fish left Newfoundland. Whether from private reasons, or from more general reasons, that failed and hurt a great many of our merchants. Many of them were very hard hit by it, and we did not get the prices that we wanted. This year these people do not seem able to pay any better prices than before. Now, this is very serious to us, because of course it is our one and only produce yet. It need not be, at all, but so far it is; and as the Harmsworth people were held up from giving us employment by the very big strike, that also has left a great many people out of employment in the winter; further, the discouragement of the paper and pulp industry by the position of trade outside has left us in difficulties there this winter.

These are temporary difficulties, but Newfoundland is a country that recuperates very quickly. I was there in 1895 when our two Banks failed and the bank notes in our pockets were no good, when nearly all the merchants closed up, and yet in a few years we were swinging clear again and everything was going gaily, and during the war we were probably more prosperous than any other little place. But there are signs of improvement. These improvements must come through more scientific handling of the things that we have. For instance, very successful efforts are being made now to sell our salmon on the foreign market in a fresh state. I may say that British Columbia competes with us in that, and there is a lot of tinned salmon in British Columbia stored up, and so on. That is what they told me in Washington last spring when I was down there; but as a fact we have methods now of putting our salmon from the North Atlantic on the British table so that you cannot tell the difference between salmon from the Tweed and those from our own home rivers. This year we sent nearly a million pounds of fresh salmon home, and made a great deal of money out of it for those who bought it, and doubled the price for those who caught it. At the same time, in between those places and many large places, in Labrador, for instance, I saw tons of salmon coming in just as it used to come, just split and salted and slung on big wharves, and nobody would buy it; yet there is no better food in the world than North Atlantic salmon. You that have eaten the British Columbia salmon and those who have caught ours may know how different they are. While this is a little thing, it is one that is going to help in the future a great deal, to keep our population from the vicissitudes of only having one industry to depend upon.

A great many things come into one's mind when one speaks about the possibilities of the country, because you who have been studying Newfoundland, must know, that we have been heaping up debt, and that our little population is carrying a very high public debt now, something like $51,000,000; which makes taxation high, and the difficulty of living greater. But still, in spite of that, I am sure of this—that it will pay any country to take Newfoundland under its wings and join with it; and when the time comes to federate, as it will come, I hope that Canada will not think, as she did once before, that we should be dear at $9,000,000. We shan't be dear at $50,000,000; of that I am sure, when you take us in.

There are many other things. We have been trying to develop other lines of activity, because one asset of every human being is time. Fishing can only be carried on over the North of Newfoundland and the whole of Labrador during a few months of the year, and it is quite obvious that there must be many months of the year in which time hangs on people's hands; and how to occupy them successfully is one of the problems that every man has to face. The fur industry gives us a good deal of money.

Labrador and Newfoundland are different. The average Newfoundlander does not like to be mixed with Labrador. I often hear a Newfoundlander say, "Oh, you mix us up with the Labrador", and the Labrador men say, "Oh, for God's sake don't mix us up with the Newfoundlander." (Laughter) It has been my lot to have a good deal to do with both of them, because in the work that we do of course we pick up a great many children. Even in spite of our surgery some men die and pass out, and in spite of all sorts of precautions children and helpless people are left. It has been our privilege to take care of a great many of them. We have now got two large homes, one in the North of Labrador and one in the north of Newfoundland. As children grow older we try to have them educated along mechanical lines and turn them into plumbers and electricians and mechanics, some into business courses, some into nurses; and we have just added a student of Upper Canada College from North Labrador, and he seems to be holding his own all right, although he has only had such preliminary education as we could give. (Applause)

I have twenty-one children up at the present minute, and of these I want to say that you might suppose that when they have seen motor cars and moving pictures and all the attractions of city life up here, and the opportunities in these parts, that most of them would not want to come back to a country where they cannot get those things. Now, it is a very strange thing that they nearly all do come back; in fact, every one has come back except the very few of whom we felt it was not wise for them to do so; that is generally along the lines of trained nurses, for we cannot afford to pay a child as a trained nurse what you have to pay here, so you get the benefit of our trained nurses, and you also get the benefit of the ones you marry before they come back. But I am not looking out for the handsomest and sending them up here, because they are an investment, and all my specialist work is done by returned children. I was talking to the head of the big Methodist College in St. John's not long ago. He was up to Columbia taking a degree, and he was telling me what success he had had in twenty years in educating the young Newfoundlanders and passing them through the higher University examinations like matriculations, and so on. I was very much interested, and asked him in what capacity the list which he showed me was serving their country, and he told me that every one of them had left their country. Our education is just the very reverse, because, don't you see, that for those who are educated along the lines of classical education, or along lines of work that demand that sort of life, we have no opening yet. We are going to have it some day, but these come back full of idealism, and full of the idea that they have got an asset that they must give to life.

Now, that is my own vision of life. I am speaking to an Empire Club, and I am a member of the British Empire and naturally I love it; but I don't think that any Empire is worth preserving if you don't have people in that Empire worth preserving. (Applause) Education that does not impart to a person the idea that life is a joyous venture which you go into for what you can give out, instead of going into it for what you can get out of it, is a rank failure. So, when I see our people coming back, as they are doing, and as you will see them on the Coast, if you come there, taking far less important positions in life, as far as dollars and cents go, and taking positions in which they can see that they can contribute very definitely what they have to give for life, you will see that they are just as happy and just as long-lived, and when it comes to thinking over things, they have as much to rejoice in as those that have the wider opportunities. They see in the concrete their adaptation to the Empire. When you can take a portion of the Empire like that and see it grow up in character and development, as I think it has,—and there are some in this room who have been down to see us, and who have seen our people—you will realize that the last thing you would want to do would be to take our people and send them up to the city.

Now, the British people and the British Empire have always depended upon and loved and admired the genius for the seas that our people have. You know, as well as I can say it, we almost owe our existence to-day to our seamen of the sixteenth century and the centuries after, and that blood is born and preserved in our people They are real sailors from the word "go", and I have seen them under every possible circumstance of life; for I am a master mariner, I run my own ship, and I have been running it over there all these years. I know a sailor when I see one and as far as our people are concerned they are real seafaring people. That type does produce a character that is very attractive not only to Englishmen but to everybody. They are very resourceful. When trouble comes such men do not wait for others to act; they look to themselves to do it. When you see one of our men with that vision of life setting out to improve his condition, he calls upon almost every capacity he has got. This you don't always have in civilization, because you recognize that if you can earn dollars you can pay for some one who can do it quicker. The seafaring life also develops another characteristic which is very attractive, and that is, the simplicity and hospitality and the simple faith in life itself that our men have. You rarely ever hear of a suicide in Labrador and Newfoundland, however poor in circumstances a man may feel there. I only remember one, and that was where a man was starving and desperately hopeless, and that was the first year we got there. He was so isolated he could not get food for himself and his children, and, as a matter of fact, he sent out his wife and his daughter and eldest son and then shot himself; but he happened to be at an extremely remote place away from any help. It is a singular characteristic of our people that, as a rule, they are much more contented than people you meet in later age in civilized life.

I just want to say a word or two more. Canada has been recently pushing down the coast still further. This year you had one of your boats surveying on the Grand Fiord in Eskimo Bay. I was talking to some of our politicians the other day, and they did not seem to be aware of the fact, and they said, "But what are they doing down there, those Canadians?" (Laughter) I said, "I guess they are fixing the boundary line." I can tell you this, as far as Labrador men go, they don't care how far east they put it. They were surveying that up. As I can give time, I have been gradually giving a week or month or two to running a partial survey of Eastern Labrador. I first began some years ago when we had an old Scotch Governor out, William McGregor, who was always much fonder of shooting a star than a bird or a deer, so we had a little survey as far as Hudson Bay Straits; but in Labrador itself there has been very little done.

I may say that latterly there must be at least a hundred large fiords of which practically nothing is known. Those who know the great fiords of Norway, Iceland and Greenland have been attracted by their wonderful cliffs and fiords. There must have been some who have visited the fiords in Iceland, or the Norway fiords. It has been my lot to visit them all. I began in the North Sea, but I tell you there are none finer than what I have been up this summer. I joined a friend who made a big tour of that coast, and had a little surveying, and a Princeton lad came with me, and in one fiord we could not find any trace of human life, and I do not think anybody had ever been up there before. I found fishermen fishing in the mouth of it, and I found fish perhaps twenty miles up where the fiord begins to divide. It divides into three fingers; one ran outside of the great granite mass which is the basal rock of which Labrador Peninsula is formed, and that runs for thirty or thirty-five miles, and though it is full of cold water that had been fairly well known to the Eskimo, a number of Eskimos there have fished it out for sea trout; as to those other arms, I could not find anybody who had been up. We chose the middle arm and went up forty miles from the headland. The average cliffs on both sides were about 2000 feet, sometimes rising 4000. The fiord, by my recollection, is never more than a mile or a mile and a half wide at the utmost, and we came "plunk" up against the head of this fiord with a 3650-foot cliff, which we scaled, and tried to make our charts or cross observations from the top. Like one of those big glacial valleys, it has been scooped out, and in the top of it ran two heavy valleys filled with grass. Those are north of the tree line there, but full of willows. We anchored in the very deep water all the way up. You can only anchor by dropping your long line and pulling into the shore and putting your anchor at the outer end, and then tying to the shore, so that you get a sort of talus that has been dropped by the subsidence. When we woke up next morning, looking on the bench I saw a herd of caribou roaming on the beach. We were somewhat in want of meat, so we went up and brought a couple of big bucks down for eating. As we walked up this hill where we were going to take our observations, out of all those side valleys filled with little gushes from the streams coming down, would fly those large ptarmigans, and the seals were playing around us in the harbour itself. When we went back it was that same thing, and we came up again, and in the morning here were the caribou back again, but we did not want any more. The next night we went up into the other valley, and there we had the same shooting if we wanted it—a lot of caribou there; and I thought there must be lots of people now in Canada who would love to see things like this.

We put another fiord on the map this year—we have not finished the drawings yet—about 150 miles south of that. We went up a new one which is called, Karririktu. I had never been up it, though I know some people that have been; perhaps a dozen of our men have been up it. When we got to the bottom of it, we came to a large river; so we got a large motor-boat to go up this river, and I had a couple of men that I got from the outside, half-breeds, who had been up the river before. As we went up in the big motor-boat we shot all the geese we wanted; there were hundreds of them swimming about but they did not take much notice of us, and we also picked up a lot of black duck. A few miles farther up we came to a fall, thirty or forty feet high, the whole width of this broad river. We climbed the hills and made charts of them. Then we came down and fished in the river. The salmon in all those rivers take flies. I did not try those other rivers in the north because I did not have flies; but an eye-specialist from Chicago came down to give me some eye-work this year, and he went up one of our rivers, the Eagle River. I do not know how much dependence you can put on a salmon fisherman's first experience (laughter) but he holds the world's record for shying a salmon line, and he had eleven medals and had won the championship for throwing a fly, and he never caught a salmon in his life. But he used to throw them on the Midway Plaisance in Chicago; that is where he threw the fly. (Laughter) However, he came down this year and said he caught twenty salmon in four hours, and they weighed over twenty-four pounds; that is the record he is going to give at the fisherman's dinner in Chicago. There were a great many taken this year in that river, and as my friend from Hartford, Connecticut, has been up a number of times, and was up fishing a little before I came back, he will no doubt be down again.

We went up another bay, called Holytoke, and we are going to one or two next year. I cannot conceive any better fun for a man with a yacht than to go down the Labrador Coast with one of those pilots, and the next year go down himself, and have the excitement of going up to places where nobody else has ever been. That is one of those things that will induce a big tourist traffic one of these days. There is no hotel, and you have to stick to your boat, and you cannot see those places in the ordinary way, I do believe that we have a tourist paradise on the east coast of Labrador, as I can demonstrate with my pictures, when I get them into order again, and am able to show some.

Now, I have wandered about a great deal in what I have said, and have not mentioned what I wanted to say; but I have put in thirty years there, and I want you to take that as a guarantee that I believe in the country. I believe in it for its physical assets, for its proximity to England, and I believe in it because we are already conquering all those things that are in hostility to us, if I may say so.

I met a young Australian the other day, and he said "I am coming down to see you this winter." I said, "How are you coming?" He said, "I am going to fly down; I have secured a hangar, and we are coming to put up a permanent one." I said, "We have a few hospitals and schools, and in the schools of industry we have gone in for work, and I am very glad to see it." He said, "I am going to make a wireless telephone; I will make half a dozen, and I am going to give you one of those, and I shall be able to get you while I am flying, and get you on the exchange, and talk to you." (Laughter) He is going down to connect our electric light station, and he is going to locate the salt for the boats when they come down on the ice-fields. He is sure he can do it. That is one of the many ways in which the place can be opened up.

With regard to the reindeer, that is another one of many ways it can be opened up. I brought 300 reindeer about twelve or fifteen years ago, into North Newfoundland. I meant to put them in Labrador but, owing to the earlier winter I could not land them; the sea froze up before I got them over. They multiplied very rapidly; we have never had to feed them; they cost next to nothing. I raised 1500 of them, but I did not get the protection I needed. Under the autonomous government which we have, the touch between the member for the district and the people is so intimate that I could not persuade him to prevent his electorate from shooting my reindeer, (laughter) so eventually I had to move the reindeer on to Canadian soil, and now they are under the Department of Indian Affairs on the Canadian Labrador at a place called Baie de Riche, where they are doing very well. I am sure there is a great future for them, because they use a country that cannot be used otherwise, arguing only from experience in other places; because you know Stefansson and the Hudson Bay Company and others are taking up the matter on a large scale, much like the Americans. I do not want to refer to that too intimately, because that is only one of the things that I know must be. Those of us who know the country will know that it will supply millions of those things, and that the broad fields will become more and more valuable, and that we need only to fly in the air and dive under the sea.

We are introducing a large number of small industries. We can run shipping perfectly well there, but every ship we brought in suffered from the dogs; but we are getting over that. We have introduced looms, and home-spun and other work. It has always been my idea that when a doctor has healed a patient and sent him back to the conditions that produced the disease he has made one mistake and it would have been better, if it cost another year, to keep him under his care rather than send him back to die from that disease. When we have convalescents we put them into a place where they can make toys or home-spuns or mats and other things that we finish for the market. This year we have started, in addition to other things, a co-operative weaving company, because the people in the winter used always to go into the country to haul fire-wood, and in some places they found it difficult to find fire-wood, but by opening that work we found they make a great deal more.

The other day I tried two girls out to see what they could make at weaving at seventy cents a yard on home-spun cloth, and they were able to make seventy cents an hour; they could make the very best high-classed home-spuns at the rate of a yard an hour. In three hours the first girl had done three full yards, and in two hours and six minutes the other girl, with a finer warp, had done two yards and six inches. When we develop those things as we are developing them, we can see them coming on slowly, and I am sure that while our poor markets have made it a little difficult, and while the colony itself is feeling the pinch of the aftermath of war, I want you to think of us not as a people who come to you for help because there is no future for us, but rather as a worth-while section of the Empire, one that is going to be a benefit and a credit to Canada in time to come, not only for what it gave you during the war, but for what it will give you as a people of the finest of the sea-genius of our race. (Loud applause)

MR. JUSTICE CRAIG said that he was glad of the opportunity to move a vote of thanks, because he was interested in a work similar to what Dr. Grenfell had outlined—the British and Foreign Sailors' Society. He was sure that Dr. Grenfell could not devote his life as he had done for so many years unless he believed the people were worth saving, were worth spending his time on. He had been impressed with the speaker's remark that no man could do his work well unless he loved it. Simply working for dollars did not imply successful work; but the thought that the work achieved something both in the worker's own mentality and in the life of the nation made work valuable and meaningful. No man had conceived and worked that idea to a fuller extent than had Dr. Grenfell. (Applause) There were a few real heroes in the history of the world, and the Club had one present to-day. (Applause) Dr. Grenfell loved humanity and then loved good work that would produce something for humanity. The Club had listened to a remarkable address. If Newfoundland, as Dr. Grenfell had hoped, would come into the union with Canada it would solve one of our legal problems as to who owned Labrador. (Laughter) He was sure he was expressing the pleasure of the whole Club in moving a hearty vote of thanks to the speaker of the day. (Loud applause)

THE PRESENT UNREST IN EGYPT

AN ADDRESS BY MR. CHAS. T. CURRELLY, M.A.,
DIRECTOR ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto,
November 24, 1921.

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: We are exceedingly fortunate in having one of our own citizens to speak on a subject which at this particular period is most important in the affairs of the Empire. A few weeks ago you heard a gentlemen talk on a similar subject mainly about the Arabs and the European questions involved; he also touched on Egypt. Prof. Currelly to-day will devote his attention entirely to Egypt, a subject and a country with which he is thoroughly familiar, as he spent many years there at various times, and he still keeps up a close contact with Egyptian matters. This is particularly interesting to us, because Prof. Currelly is one of ourselves. I think he will be able to weave into his story of the political and economic situation some of the more intimate incidents of his own experiences and of his knowledge which will make more clear to us the situation in Egypt as it is to-day. It is opportune just now, because you will have observed in the press two or three days ago that the delegation from Egypt which has been in London for three or four months past has not yet been able to make an arrangement, as they call it, with the British Government whereby the Empire may be able to give to Egypt complete independence with proper safeguards. On that account that particular part of the Empire is still in an uncertain condition. I have much pleasure indeed in calling upon Prof. Currelly.

MR. CURRELLY

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I feel that I owe you an apology for appearing before you here, before such a serious body as yours, with a subject that is of a very personal and almost private kind. I am not in a position to treat this matter from a diplomatic standpoint; I can only speak to you about the conditions as I saw them, and the conditions about which I talked with the Egyptians themselves when living with my own workmen—all alone with them, and night after night sitting around after the work was over and talking to them. Therefore to a certain extent I am biased. I am presenting to you the position as it comes from the workmen of Egypt; that is the position that I found appealed to practically all the British who were there for their sympathy was entirely with the labouring class in Egypt, and it is the expression of that sympathy that has had a great deal to do with bringing about the present condition.

Now, I do not think anyone can understand Egyptian affairs without considering the very peculiar geography of the district. As you know, the whole of Upper Egypt is just the flats of a river. You can see across it. It is a very long country, but all the way along you can see from one side of the country to another. It is just the flats of the Nile. The moment you get to the hill that the river has cut away you are into barren land worth absolutely nothing; so that the people are strung out in a long line on each side of the river banks. This has always prevented them from getting very close together. People in a place like Ontario, in a square block, can mass; you get massed opinion; you get a community in Egypt; it has its neighbours on one side and on the other, that is all. Furthermore, according to that curious thing that has always caused men to desire a certain amount of feud, the sides of the Nile have been at feud with each other from the earliest time, so they have comparatively little to do with each other. Now, that leaves the two strips of people strung along the bank like a village with one street, and consequently there is very, very great difficulty in the Egyptian people getting together physically, mentally or any other way.

Again, owing to the nature of their country, the individual plays a very small part in his own maintenance; the Government plays by far the larger part. If the Government will give them irrigation they can grow crops; if the Government will not, they must die. So that they are in a very different position from any other people that I know of, because they are entirely dependent upon the Government; which has tended very much indeed to sap their sense of independence. It is very difficult for a man to face the next year and say, "If I get water I can do so-and-so All my work is in vain if for any reason I am debarred from getting a proper amount of water." Now, this has made it that Egypt has either been a very wealthy or a poverty-stricken country, according to the Government. One can trace it through all the ages.

One of the most dramatic instances of this took place at the close of the Greco-Roman period, the Byzantine period, when the country was too poor to float a copper currency, and the people got along with the few lead tokens. Four thousand Arabs conquered Egypt, and within a century and a half it was the richest country in the world. One example after another of that kind can be given.

Geographical conditions often tend to make mental ones. Perhaps that very dependence upon the Government for their water, which means their food, has brought about the condition of mental dependence on the part of the people. We very proudly say that Britons never will be slaves. I think it is quite right; I don't think any master could put up with us. Just imagine a real good Scotchman with a turn for argument as your own slave, for instance. (Laughter) I speak a little from the master's standpoint, because I have had slaves—rented ones—but still I know what the question is, and there is a masters' side to that situation. I am sure that Britons never will be slaves—at least no one will ever pay for them; that I am sure of. (Laughter) Now, the Egyptian is something of a slave by nature. He has never been a fighting man. From the earliest times one finds a negro mercenary or some other type of mercenary being hired to do his fighting for him. These two things go together; the fighting man, as a rule, is not a very good slave; the man who will not fight seems, as a rule, to end in becoming more or less of a slave.

Now, the rule in Egypt has been invariably a foreign rule. The mercenaries who were brought in there from time to time, going as far back as you like, said very naturally, "Why should we fight to keep the country in order for those people? We will run it ourselves." And so the head of the mercenaries was pretty well the king of Egypt. That must be borne in mind when we speak of the Egyptians. And here I would remind you how curiously in the east there are races living side by side. When I speak of Egyptians I mean the Egyptians in blood. One often speaks of the Turks as if they were the people of Turkey; but there is a race called the Turks somewhat related to the Chinese, who came in and conquered the country, but they are very few in number, although they have held that great Empire. I am sorry to say the Turks have very little to do with the Government of their own Empire, owing to this condition of mercenary soldiers that I spoke of. This foreign rule has produced, of course, a foreign aristocracy, which had tended more to reduce the people to something very close indeed to serfdom.

Coming to modern times, the last turnover in the way of mercenaries was that of Mahomed Ali. He was an Albanian peasant, but enlisted in one of the regiments of mercenaries kept by the Mahmouds. He was a man of enormous physical strength and great power of organization, though he could neither read nor write, and—perhaps for that very reason—he had an amazing memory. He could punish people himself, which endeared him to that class. If a man was brought in front of him he took up his whip, gave him the punishment then and there, and then the court went on again. He finally became a colonel, and this command was his opportunity. He got the other Albanians to agree to another division of spoils, and with a sudden movement one afternoon he swung a revolution, massacred the whole of the Mamelukes, who had been the nobility and governing class of the country before, and put himself in their place. Now, you can see how all his colonels and captains and majors, and so on, would each take a share from those massacred Mamelukes, and thus you had a new nobility setting itself up, controlling this large land. Mahomed Ali was a roughly honest individual; he gave them extremely good Government, and the result was that Egypt prospered very much indeed under his rule, so much so, that he tried to make an attack on Constantinople. His descendants were not as good as himself, and in our own days when Ismail Pasha, who was a very good farmer, came to the throne a great deal was hoped from him. However, the moment he ascended the throne of Egypt he instituted the greatest riot of expenditure that possibly the world has ever known. Everybody who could bring a new show to Cairo was sure of a fortune. Ismail required 200 carriages and pairs and coachmen to drive out his harem every morning. The riot of expenditure gradually sapped the resources of the country. Then the Suez Canal question came on; and to give you an example of how mad things were, practically everybody who applied was invited to attend the opening of the Suez Canal at the Khedive's expense; that is, practically any one of you could have written saying that you were particularly interested in canal construction, etc., and you would have had a letter which would have meant a free pass from here to Egypt, everything free in Egypt, and put you back home again. (Laughter) Extraordinary places were instituted where wonderful free lunches were given, and if you had the right badge you walked in and got a champagne lunch as many times a day as you liked, and free café, and everything else, and the whole thing went in the bill to the Government.

Now, this mad riot of course drew attention to things. The Khedive had been borrowing money till he was down. If a man felt that his position in society, or diplomacy or anything else, was threatened, he could call on the Khedive and would usually get, at least, a five pound note out of him before he left. The condition was something appalling. The different financial interests then stepped in and implored England and France to do something, and the country was taken over as a kind of receivership. When that took place things had reached their limit. Taxes were collected three years in advance—I hesitate to mention that fact in Toronto (laughter) but that is the fact. The coinage had been reduced by sending out silver-plated currency, and then when the people started to pay that back as taxes they were informed that a very bad man had been at the head of the currency at that time and the Government could not take that back except at fifty cents on the dollar, so that they were making a little on that again. Every mortal thing that could be done was done.

One of my men, who was with me for some years as a young man, rose to considerable importance in the Province, because as a torturer he could extract money from people long after any other torturer in the Province had given them up; so that that little hoard, often consisting of a little Roman gold, or even of Greek gold coin, or a little bit of golden something that the oriental hangs on to like grim death, had finally to come down his sleeve and go into the Government's coffers .

To give you an example of how mad things were, there is a story told—and believed—of one of Ismail's favourites coming in to him on one occasion and saying, "Look here, your Excellency, I have got to have a hundred pounds; I have got to have it." "Well," he says, "I don't know. I can't get any money out of the treasury; the treasurer says he hasn't any and he can't borrow any, and I have to do without it." But the man says, "Your

Excellency, I really must have one hundred pounds"; so Ismail said, "Well, let us see, isn't there any way of getting it? By-the-bye, I have got it; so and so, that cigar man, you go down and buy 10,000 boxes of Havana cigars and see if he won't give you a hundred pounds rake-off on it, and then have him send the bill in to the treasurer." (Laughter) I think even my friend over here (bowing to Mr. A. E. Ames) would say that that was really high finance (laughter) but it ruined the country.

Then came England and France taking the position of receivership to see if something could not be done to check this waste, and enable the financial interests of Europe to get their money. The thing did not last very long until Arabi Pasha, urged on by certain people—I believe he didn't want it himself—brought about a revolution. The French were not in a very good position to send any soldiers there, so they said to the English, "For goodness sake, go on and handle this yourself, and we will withdraw except in accordance with certain agreements, and in a nominal way"; so there was a bombardment of Alexandria and the battle of Tel-el-Kebir, that ended this revolution. It was a most astonishing thing when Arabi chained a number of gunners to their guns in Alexandria, and the gun-boat fired a number of shots at the bridge, and the poor fellows had to stand there and take the fire from the ships. There is an amusing story of a Scotch doctor who was visiting his patients, and who went into one of the side batteries. One of the British ships got exactly opposite his battery and banged near the Scotchman, and enthusiastically he said to the gunner, "Now, now is your chance, give it to them now!" But the gunner replied, "Me shoot at him, he shoot at me!" and he would not take any part in the proceedings; the British had not discovered him yet, and he was not going to give the show away. (Laughter)

At Tel-el-Kebir a very remarkable thing happened. One group of artillery men stood to their guns while the bombardment took place. Their commanders were both hit in about the first five minutes' fighting. One of them had himself propped up, and shouted to the other men to defend their guns, and when the British got in the officer said, "Who are the Europeans that defended this battery?" and this colonel said, "I am." He was then taken to a hospital where he got better, and promptly joined the British Army. (Laughter)

Now, with the taking over of Government of Egypt the whole situation depended on the problem of water. A real genius took over that matter—Sir William Wilcox. He was not only a good engineer, but a good linguist, and he walked the whole length of Egypt—1,000 miles up and 1,000 miles down. He kept his tents and men about a mile and a half behind, so that he was always alone. Any peasant could drop into step with him and discuss the whole water question, and it was perfectly amazing how rapidly he began to stop the leakages which allowed one man to get more than his portion of water, and thereby prevented the other man from getting enough —because in Egypt there is really no water to spare, and if one man gets a little too much by way of feeing the right people, it means that his neighbour must get that much less, because each division of the country gets so many millions of gallons, and that is all. Wilcox, by this method of getting in direct touch, got to know all the ins and outs of it as very few officials ever have. They say he knew practically every citizen of Egypt of the male persuasion, and so he knew how everything was going, and the change in affairs was something perfectly extraordinary.

During the Ismail Pasha orgy of spending, the peasants were not allowed to leave their land, because of course that left it without the taxes. Most of the time the land was not paying the taxes, but they were not allowed to give it up. They were driven back to the land by soldiers, and the man had to stay on his land and pay the taxes, whether he got anything out of it or not; and of course a great deal of the time there was no water, and the land would grow no more than would that table. Egypt will grow nothing unless it is given water; for it is nothing but a dry sandy desert, if lacking water.

The rise in price of land was extremely rapid. The opening up of branches from the canal carried the water out from the Nile in every direction, and dividing the water evenly with as much honesty as could be drilled into the petty officials, immediately began to make land rise in price. Certain men saw their opportunity, and bought heavily, and those men became enormously wealthy, because land advanced. When the British took it over the value was about $2.50 an acre, and it advanced to from $300 to $1,000 an acre for ordinary farm land, on which, as you understand, they get many crops a year. In this time the worker, who forms the largest part of the population, suddenly found himself in a certain land of peace. He could get justice. He is always a hopeful person; he is a marvellous optimist; and I think that perhaps the stories they love to tell each other, more or less founded on facts, and relating to the finding of treasure, and getting on in the world have had no mean part in keeping up the buoyancy of the people.

But it is sometimes disastrous to find a treasure. I remember that some years ago, near Karnak, a peasant earning ten cents a day suddenly found in a wall that he had opened up, a little pocket with three large jars of Roman gold coins. It upset his whole nervous system very seriously. He took the jars home, however, and then grabbing a handful of them, he stuck them into his garment and rushed off to the big man of the district and said, "You think you are the big man of the district, but I want you to understand you are not any longer so; I am the rich man of the district, and I thought I would come at once and tell you so." The man said, "What are you talking about? You are all right; you are a decent chap, and I have employed you many times; now, go home." The peasant replied, "You don't believe that I am the richest man of the district? Just look here!"—

and he pulled out the gold. The man said, "Go home, and don't say a word to anybody; I have been your friend, and I will always see you through everything." So he got the man out, and he immediately sat down and considered the situation—from a financial man's standpoint. (Laughter) He had a straight buttoned-up coat, very much like a parson wears, tight to the neck, which is called a Stamboul uniform; that is what important men wear on important occasions. He knew that the head of the police was a friend of his, so he borrowed a policeman's uniform. He put one of his servants into the police uniform and another into this Stamboul, to act as Governor, and he coached them very carefully. He then had some of his men dressed up till they looked pretty much like Government officers. When it got dark he rushed into the peasant's hut and said, "You fool, you have been talking about this thing, and the government is going to seize the whole treasure; you know you have been talking about it." The peasant thought the man was talking business all this time, and he said, "What can I do, Your Honour?" He replied, "They are going to seize it, no doubt about that, but they don't know how big it is. I will buy half of it from you, and I will give you a half of an English sovereign for each one, and I am afraid we will have to give the other over to them, there is no way out of it, but I will stand by you, and we will both swear that that is all there was." So the gold was counted out, and the half passed over, very, very beautiful gold pieces worth about a hundred dollars, and the peasant received an apron full of half-cent pieces in return—that is why I mentioned it as a financial deal. (Laughter) The man had timed the whole thing very nicely, so that by the time he had received the treasure, a rap came to the door and the policeman said, "Open, in the name of the law." So in came the Governor—another of his servants, in this Stamboul uniform—and said he understood the treasure had been found, and he came to claim it in the name of the law. The poor peasant handed out the half of it;

and then the commander stood with him to pat him a little bit, and then joined the two servants as quickly as possible, because he could not trust them any too much; (laughter) so he got home with the three pots of gold, and the peasant had about fourteen or fifteen cents. (Laughter)

Now, these stories of finding things are frequent, I may say. The story of the rise of that family is that years ago they were boatmen in the north, and in the middle of the night a beggar came, and was driven away. but came and came, and was driven away again and at last, being tired of being wakened up, the boatman got up and gave him a measure of Indian corn, and he said, "Good!" He then went to sleep again, and a little while after was called up by a very brilliant-looking person who came and said, "Come with me!" He was taken to the great temple of Karnak, and mysteriously a couple of stones were turned back, and he walked into the passage and then into a room where gold was heaped up right from the floor to the wall. He piled it into his garment, but the man shook him and handed out his small measure and said, "This much and no more." That is the rise of that very family, who added to their already considerable riches by getting these three pots of gold.

Now, those stories tend tremendously to shape the country. There is that hope that every little while they are going to get up, up! up! If you want to read a fascinating book on the whole east, read "Hadji Baba"; this hope is very marked now in Egypt.

The dread of the people is their fear of their officials. The whole of officialdom is a class—a class bound together by millenniums of traditions, a class that never will go back on itself, but always knows that it must keep the peasants in check; so that one of their great difficulties is to protect the peasant from his own fear. I think that has tended to make him childish, too. The graft, of course, is something terrible. Honour, in an abstract sense, is practically unknown; honesty, in an abstract sense, is unknown, though a person may be among the most scrupulously honest, individually; that is, I may have a servant, or a man, or a thousand men, working for me who would not steal a pin from me, yet they might steal everything you had. It is personal.

Now, I think a great deal has been brought about by the terrorism in which they have lived. I might speak of one thing that the government had to do, that was, to shut up the witness booths. It took a long time to shut them up. The witness booth is not familiar in our own courts, I believe, but it is very familiar in the east. It is often an expensive matter to bring up witnesses for a trial; it is much cheaper, and they are much better witnesses, if you will hire professionals just outside the court; so witness booths line the streets which are near the court-house, and the more money you have the better witnesses you employ, and therefore the more chance you have to win your case. (Laughter) It was a long, time before the British succeeded in clearing out those witness booths. I can give you a story of a trial before an English judge where practically the whole village came up—in this case, not employing professionals at all—and half the village came up and swore that their man's ground had been tumbled out of its crop by the herds of the defendant's cattle being driven across it by another man. The other part of the village swore that a cow had walked across his land, and the damage was not to be reckoned at more than a cent or two at most, that practically not a blade of grain had been damaged. The judge was supposed to go on the next day, but something prevented it, and he decided he would ride over, though a very long distance, to find out for himself. When he got there he discovered that the landowner who was suing for damages did not own an inch of land, and that the man whose cattle had done the damage did not own a hoof; but there had been a row over a woman, and they thought it would be more polite to try it as I have shown it. (Laughter)

Now, in tackling the problem of English Government, you see you have the peasant with his fear, who is afraid to give honest testimony, because he does not know when the Englishman will withdraw, and he is beginning to wonder about his withdrawal, feeling that he is his only saviour; yet he may often turn on the very Englishman who is trying to help him, because of his age-long fear of his own officials. Not only have the officials had the terrible difficulty of handling this proposition, but certain Englishmen, with a desire for advertising for political purposes, have gone out there and stirred up all the trouble they could, so that the officials found themselves more or less knifed from within. Some time ago I went out in the desert a very long distance with one of the men of the interior, to settle a difficulty owing to an attack being made on some salt works. There was a salt lake away out in the desert, and some Scotch boys were turning it into soda by a process they had that was not so bad; they were also making salt. This man raised all kinds of a row, then got up in the House of Commons in England and asked if they knew that the people of Egypt were being poisoned in order to make money for British millionaires. I might say these were only quite poor boys who were charged with poisoning the people of Egypt with poisoning salt. Chemical analysis showed that the impurity was one in ten thousand of Epsom salts, which was pretty good for them. (Laughter)

Again, a certain labour member came out, went to Lord Cromer, and said, "My Lord, I have proof that Mr. So-and-So, the head of Such-and-Such a department, has been taking huge bribes for the suppression of punishment of crime. I am thoroughly capable of going into the matter, and evidence has been laid before me, and there is not the faintest possible doubt that he is guilty; therefore, I demand that he be tried, as there is no doubt whatever that he is guilty." Lord Cromer is a very shrewd man. He said, "If you have gone into it there can of course be no doubt in the matter, therefore you will not object to sign an agreement that if Mr. So-and-So should be proved to be innocent you will apologize to him in every paper in the United Kingdom, because an official in the Government at once is condemned in the minds of most people, and even if he is acquitted they usually say that the commission has White-washed him." The labour member got up and walked out. He was lying. One of the best men in the whole Egyptian service was the one he had attacked, and the whole thing was a long story that I will not tell you.

Now, the difficulty is that, knowing that everything is watched with the view of making trouble for advertising purposes in the British press, the men sometimes do not know where they are. Here are a number of people with tears in their eyes appealing to them for help, appealing to them for mercy, appealing to them for a living, and they find themselves impeded in trying to give them this living, not only by the people who have for years oppressed those poor people, but from behind, too.

I remember a case down in Suakin, a little out of Egypt, but under similar conditions, where a young lieutenant was sitting in front of his hut, and he saw a Bagara Arab passing with a sack on his shoulder. He thought he saw the sack move, and he said to his coolie, "Go and open that sack." Out rolled a small nigger whom he recognized as the son of one of his own soldiers. Now, those Bagara Arabs had been known to take boys and run them across to Yeddo, where they had been made into eunuchs, about one per cent. of them, and if they could get one across in a year those fellows could live in very great comfort. There was a boy from the garrison stolen. The lieutenant asked his sergeant major, "What will I do? If I shoot or hang that fellow there is not a particle of doubt I shall lose my commission; some Greek or Armenian, or somebody will get the story through to the press and there will be talk of British brutality, and hanging without proper trial, and all this sort of thing; yet if I don't do it, and send him down, he will spend three months in jail, perhaps at Suez, and he will be better fed than ever in his life before, and he will sit in the sun and play tick-tack with a lot of other scoundrels, and he will be back to his old tricks again."

Well, the sergeant-major knew his own people, and he said, "Well, Sir, if I were you I would not do anything to him, but I would put a soldier on each side of him, and make him take the boy back to the women's quarters." The lieutenant said, "I didn't know of that; that will do splendidly." The fellow was marched back to the women's quarters, and it was announced that he had this boy in the sack, and it was told them what he intended to do with the boy; and those women flew at that fellow and they tore his flesh off his bones, and he died on the spot; he was dismembered by their fingers. That stopped the practice.

Though I went to Egypt as a Canadian, without predisposition to look at the matter from one side or the other, you cannot live in that country without yourself becoming a petty judge. They come to every Englishman. During my time, and even much earlier, the oath by the word of an Englishman was more serious even than an oath by the beard of the prophet; and men who would lie when they had sworn by the beard of the prophet would not lie if they had sworn by the word of an Englishman. (Applause) That was a thing to be proud of; and every Englishman becomes a little petty centre of justice, because the things are brought to him for settlement without taking them any further.

In order for the English officials to administer, of course great masses of natives, of those original old-fangled ways, are employed; they are watched as closely as possible, but you cannot catch them, one of the reasons being that the native is so afraid of them that he will not give evidence against them. I have known, when one of our own men was hurt, in a row, and was taken away for treatment, the treatment was that he was kicked into a room and told that he would be let out when he paid the attendant half a sovereign. You cannot get anything done; you cannot make them talk. Graft is their only view of life, absolutely. The English are trying to cut that down. Of course the peasant got richer and richer when the land went up from $2.50 an acre in many cases to $1,000, and the native officials were getting only a small salary. Here was the peasant, out of whom he could have wrung thousands of dollars, but that puzzling Englishman there would not let him. Can you wonder that the native official was angry? His whole training was that he had the right, by right of birth, to wring the last dollar out of the peasant.

Then there was another class, the very large class of the Scribes, or those mentioned in the Bible, the writers, they could float their sons out into the world by the fact that they could read and write. They charged a quarter of a day's wages for simply writing a letter, a whole day's wages for writing and addressing a letter, and that was put into their contract. They slipped into the side of the contract many a nice little plum that the peasants had been working hard for. So that here was another class to be reckoned with. The English opened schools, and of course absolutely raised the hatred of the whole class of Scribes, because their sons would have to go to work the moment the peasant learned to read and write. Then there were the sons of the adventurers who had come under Ismail's regime. Those men had the stories from their fathers, of the riot of money of Ismail's time, and now they contrasted their own poverty with it. They started to work on those people. One of the head men, who gave himself the title of Sheik Musem, tried to import a prostitute whose father kept drug bane, and was objected to on the ground of his character by the father. (Laughter) That will give you some kind of a clear idea as to the gentleman himself. They employed a man to edit a paper or two. They started working up unrest. We believe now that they were financed by German money. We did not know it then, but there was evidently plenty of money going. I was living with a man who was paid by the government to try to keep a watch on them, and the whole question was where the money was coming from that kept those scoundrels going, because they were nothing but adventurers, who did not do anything of any kind. It surprised the people very much indeed when they started this propaganda to drive out the English.

I visited Abraham Bush, who had 7,000 acres of land without one weed—a proud old Egyptian farmer—and he said that two or three days before an old peasant had run into him and said, "Your Excellency, what is this about driving out the English? What are we going to do if they go? What in the world can we do? You were governor, you know how you used to watch us yourself." The people were in absolute terror. I suppose literally thousands of them came to me and said, "What is this about the English going to go away? What are we going to do if they do? What if there is nobody to hold those fanatics in check?" On the other hand, it appealed to other people. One of the big Assyrian merchants, when the trouble was just beginning, said, "Why should the English violently take themselves out of here? I said, "Mr. Hademby, I do not expect you to understand it, I could hardly expect you to believe it, but I would like you to take my word for it that the British have no such notion in the matter; but you cannot understand that without being British, no one can understand the way Britain handles things unless he is British, and then he realizes that he knows nothing about it." (Laughter) He said, "Well, do you mean to tell me that when twenty police men could stop this whole miserable affair, and the British Government will not send the twenty policemen to do it, that they do not see something in it for them?" I said, "No. By the way, suppose the British left, what would you do?" He said, "I would leave within seven days; that would be the whole time that anyone as rich as I am could stay here; I don't think I could realize on everything and be out in seven days, but if I did not my wealth would mysteriously disappear." That was the feeling of the rich men. Old Abraham Bush told me, "There is not one man of any property or tradition in this affair"; and that was the condition at that time. They started out on a most extreme propaganda. First they began to spread all over that the

Egyptians showed the Greeks everything; the Greeks had taught the rest of Europe, and therefore the Egyptians must be the greatest people in the world. One particular proposal that was quite seriously considered was that the poets and orators should sit in council and prepare a dictionary of abuse so that the English could be abused while they were talking, while they were in bed, while they were even taking their siestas. It would be difficult to imagine anything more silly.

Now came a curious turn. There was no revolution on the part of the government, but the soldiers were covered with filth, and had to hold their hands at their side and walk back to their barracks, and open insults for the soldiery became more or less a national sport in certain parts of Cairo, and the soldier had to straighten his shoulders and go back and get cleaned up as best he could. This was put down. Stringent laws were put in force that you must not attack a native, no matter what he said or did, but you were to take him to the court.

I remember an old gentleman who had never been in Egypt before, who was listening to a diatribe of abuse from a native. He could stand it no longer, and he way-laid the man, and broke his cane, then the man ran into the canal up to his neck, and the old man proceeded down the brick wall and began to hurl bricks at him. The owner of the wall came out and, being an oriental, he said, "This is not the right way to do; we will bring a charge of assault against him out there and get him sent to prison". (Laughter)

Now, here is one side of the things that the people discovered—that England does not desert her friends and does not punish her enemies; and that is a very prominent characteristic of the British Government. If you oppose them they do not repulse you. If you side with them they don't forget you. Therefore the people, being very shrewd, saw very quickly that if they sided in with those rascally fellows, and the English left, they would be in with that one crowd. If the British did not leave, they would not be touched; but if on the other hand they did as they believed to be right, and remained true to the English cause, and the English did leave, then they knew that every scrap of their property would be confiscated at once. So they continued to swing over and say, "This is awful; we will go right in with you." Sometimes they would go a little too far. I remember one of the Coptic papers, when asked to join with people of their own race said, "Yes, we remember the good old days when cattle and copts were sold"—the Copts being Christians. Now, the new generation is present, that know nothing of the old past days; they have become rich, they are restless; they have had this propaganda pushed on them without any counter propaganda for years. Cairo is very, very doubtful; there are no reliable ones in Cairo. We cannot keep the streets clean. The cry of the young men is, "Why cannot they enjoy themselves? Why does he have to go off to Paris to Monte Carlo?" So that the dulness of Cairo has affected those young rich men, and this big nationalist movement has been growing for many reasons I have touched upon, and for many that I have not.

When it was thought that the British garrison was going to leave last Spring, two followers of Lloyd George went up to one of the chief nationalists, a very shrewd man indeed, and said, "It is wonderful; now we are going to have Egypt for the Egyptians. What do you advise us to do with the British?" He said, "Sell whatever land and stocks you have and invest money in Europe." That is the condition of every thinking man. Within twenty years after the British leave the people will again be back to starvation.

I thank you Gentlemen for extreme patience in listening to this rather rambling harangue.

MR. A. E. AMES, in a brief address, expressed the thanks of the Club to Mr. Currelly.

BANQUET

In the Ball Room of the King Edward Hotel, on the evening of November 29, 1921, Ladies' Night, the Empire Club had the privilege of entertaining as Guests of Honor His Excellency, the Governor-General of Canada, and Lady Byng of Vimy.

After dinner, the President in felicitous terms proposed the health of His Excellency which was received with musical honours. Lord Byng, of Vimy, replied in happy vein and spoke very appreciatively of the work of the Club and the pleasure it gave Lady Byng and himself to be present.

After musical selections were rendered, a reception was held in the drawing room and a pleasant evening brought to a delightful close.

CANADA WITHIN THE EMPIRE

AN ADDRESS BY HON. WALLACE NESBITT, K.C.

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, December 8, 1921

VICE-PRESIDENT WILKINSON: Our guest does not require any formal introduction to the Empire Club. These are times of changes, not only domestic changes, but world changes; changes commercial, changes social, changes political; and I feel that in times such as these that we have been going through during the past few years we are particularly in need of men of clear thought and of frank speech. (Hear, hear) We are fortunate to-day in having as our guest one who has both of these attributes, and I have very much pleasure in introducing to you the Hon. Wallace Nesbitt, K.C., who will address us on the subject, "Canada within the Empire."

HON. WALLACE NESBITT

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—When my secretary brought to my house last night your card announcing my appearing before you to-day I was, although somewhat old and toughened, inclined to blush at the encomiums that were passed upon me, quite undeserved I assure you, as to any gift of oratory. However, it did bring to my mind the fact that in 1912 I had the opportunity of addressing the members of the Empire Club, and it brought two thoughts in connection with that. On that occasion I took the opportunity of saying that if ever the Mother Country was in distress Canada, at least, would rally to her assistance. (Hear, hear) The other occasion was when a distinguished member of the Imperial Cabinet, at a meeting at which I was present, undertook to advise the "Colonies", as he termed them—or, as we term them, Dominions Overseas—as to their relations with the Mother country. He had strongly radical views, and advised the Colonies that if ever the Mother country became involved in any difficulties, in Europe or elsewhere, it was their duty on behalf of their citizens not to become mixed up with her quarrels; that they were of her own seeking and of her own bringing about, and that the Colonies should absolutely declare their non-participation in any such quarrels, and if necessary sever their relations so as not to be involved in them. I was called upon a few minutes afterwards to respond for Canada, and in so doing I said that I thought I represented the feelings of at least ninety per cent. of the Canadians when I resented entirely the sentiments that the Right Honourable gentleman had expressed; that what he advised was equivalent to a young and stalwart youth, Canada, standing by while the old mother was being assaulted by various ruffians, and saying to her, "You have brought this on yourself; I am not going to interfere." I said that, if we took such an attitude, I thought that the sooner we replaced at the head of our coat of arms the beaver, which we placed there for its thrift and industry, and substituted for it a somewhat malodorous North American animal called the skunk, the better. I may say that the radical gentleman was very indignant at it, and a short time afterwards cut me dead in the lobby of Westminster. Was I right? Did the great War, when it broke out in August, 1914, show that one was right in translating the sentiments not of ninety per cent. of Canadians, but the whole of Canada (hear, hear) when we were prepared to give our last drop of blood and our last ounce of treasure on behalf of that old Mother country? (Applause)

Now, passing from that for a moment, let me shortly sketch the growth of Canada up to Confederation. Up to 1840 Canada was practically represented by the thinly and sparsely populated pair of Provinces, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in the East, and by Upper and Lower Canada in the West. It was rarely that any settlement took place except for what might be called water-side communication, because it was impossible for the farmer to get his grain to the water under about fourteen cents a bushel, and from the neighbourhood of Toronto, for instance, it cost him another thirty-four cents to take his wheat to the foot of the St. Lawrence, making forty-eight cents his cost, and the price was fifty cents—not much dividend for the farmer. I do not know that the position of the farmer in the Northwest to-day, owing to the results of the great war, is very much better; because you may observe that, for 132,000,000 of bushels shipped from Montreal, we received $127,000,000, as against $234,000,000 a year ago for 109,000,000 bushels. In other words, the farmer in the Northwest is getting less at present than a dollar a bushel for his wheat, and my information is that it practically costs that money there to grow the wheat; in the case of oats it is better to leave them lying rotting in the field, or to feed them to stock if the farmer has stock, than to thresh them, because the result is that by threshing he is out of pocket several cents a bushel. In the case of live stock, for two carloads of cattle shipped recently into Winnipeg, the owner of the cattle received a debit slip, after paying the transportation charges, etc., of some $370. In the case of a man I know near Peterboro, who shipped two head of beef to Toronto, he got a debit slip of $2.35; in other words, he might better have shot his cattle and let them lie in the field than have shipped them to Toronto.

Can you wonder, then, at the unrest, almost the revolutionary feeling, among the farmers of the Northwest and throughout Ontario? It is a wonder to me that they have not been more vocal in their discontent with the prevailing condition of things,—a condition about which it is all very well to say to them, "This has been brought about by the folly of nobody except the Kaiser," —because after all, it comes to this, that owing to the depleted purchasing power of Europe, both in their ability to raise money and because they cannot pay for what they need, that condition has been brought about in Canada; and after all, we are in a better position, I think, even than they are in the United States or any country in the world.

But after 1840 came the Reciprocity Treaty, and our exports jumped from $2,000,000 to $40,000,000 within its time. Still Canada was not growing very fast. And then that bogey of the democratic folk—that bogey that the soap-box orator calls "BIG BUSINESS"—appeared in Canada; big business in the form of railway corporations that brought you railways, followed by settlement, followed by industrial undertakings. Pausing for a moment on that bogey question so much talked about during the last elections—big business—tell me anything to-day that would amount to a row of shucks if it were not for our ability to get great aggregations of capital together that are able to create large industries employing many labourers, that, so to speak, takes by the seat of the trousers, any locality in which they locate themselves, and yanks it into prosperity, if it is not big business—which it is popular, apparently, for everybody to denounce. Fancy how we could have great steel corpornations, coaling operations, railways, or anything else, unless in the form of large aggregations of capital, which do not belong to any single individuals but are the results of the contributions of stockholders, whether they be as individuals or stockholders in the form of corporations such as insurance companies, loan companies, etc.! Without big business, as it is called, what would this or any other country amount to, but small settlements, individual small traders, with none of what we call, at the present time, prosperity and progress.

Confederation came in 1867. It consisted of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec—Prince Edward Island came in afterwards. In 1869 we purchased the great Hudson Bay territory. We agreed with British Columbia to build a railway to connect the West with the East; we agreed to build the Intercolonial, which was the first experiment in what is called government ownership.

Now, understand, when I say government ownership I mean government ownership as exemplified in the working out of the Intercolonial, which has been nothing but a sink for public money since the first engine operated over it. Why? In my view government ownership, when it means government operation, can never be anything but a waste of public money. It means inefficiency; it means inattention; it means, according to the history of government operation throughout the world, the pulling down in every direction of any proper and efficient management. We are now put to an enormous debit of some $80,000,000 odd a year for the operation of the great National System. That may have its blessings as a road owned by the people, but I urge every man among you to bend his energies towards bringing about a condition of things in which the politician will have to keep his fingers off its operation. (Applause) It is protested, day after day, that the Government does not interfere. I shall be curious to see if a number of members of the Board that have been nominated by the late government are not, for various reasons, replaced by nominees of the new government. If they are, I shall be curious to see how some of our newspapers will apologize for them, and say that it in no way indicates government interference or political interference with the operation of the railways (laughter) but we will no doubt have it.

Coming back for a moment to the condition of things in 1867—and I dwell on it just for a moment for this reason, that to my mind the difficulties by way of land communication, the difficulties in bringing all those units together, the difficulty of assimilating them in one grand whole called Canada, were infinitely greater owing to the lack of transportation, owing to the lack of steamship communication, the lack of wireless telegraphy, the lack of telegraphy itself, the lack of telephone communication, etc., than exist to-day in making all the outlying portions of the Empire one unit under the aegis of John Bull & Company. (Hear, hear)

When the C.P.R. in 1883 applied for its loan, of which we heard more than once, Sir John Macdonald, who was then at the head of affairs, practically retired to Ernscliffe rather than face the music of his own caucus. Sir Charles Tupper went into the caucus, and absolutely with his fist in the face of every other member, forced that loan through, at a time when the greatest and most gifted men in Canada were protesting that to make the loan was to make a loan to a railway that would never pay for the grease on the axles of the wheels. Sir Charles Tupper had the courage of his beliefs in the future of Canada. He foresaw its future greatness with an optimism that has been justified by events. I remember when he predicted 250,000,000 bushels of grain would be grown in the Northwest, and everybody scoffed and laughed at the prediction; yet that man's courage, foresight and optimism have been justified to the last degree in what he said would be the result of the loan to the C. P. R., which was repaid long ago, and which is probably the proudest monument to-day as a commercial success that this country has produced. (Hear, hear) To my mind no man who has ever been in the public affairs of Canada—Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir John Macdonald, or anybody else—deserves the thanks of Canadians, as a great Canadian, as much as Sir Charles Tupper. (Applause) The late Joseph Chamberlain said to me in the winter of 1914 at Cannes, in discussing Canada, that in his opinion Sir Charles Tupper was much the greatest Canadian that Canada had produced because of his courage, because of his optimism, because of his belief in the Country. I believe that Mr. Chamberlain's view was correct.

Now, if Sir Charles Tupper had not had that courage, and if that loan had not gone through, all the great banking institutions of this country would have gone like that—(snapping his fingers). British Columbia would have seceded from the Confederation. With British Columbia undoubtedly would have gone what is now Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta; and I do not think it needs any prophetic instinct to see that if that had happened west of the Great Lakes and to the Pacific, Seward's dream of "one flag, (and that the American flag,) floating from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arctic Circle" would have been realized. Therefore I said we owed so much to Sir Charles Tupper. But for his courage and his optimism and his foresight I do believe Canada would not exist to-day; and he had that courage in face of an almost universal popular disapproval of the act that he was forcing through Parliament; it was the most unpopular thing in this country. What we need is men who have courage when they have beliefs, to see that those beliefs are put into operation (hear, hear) something that most of our politicians will not do unless it is popular, and unless in their belief it will carry votes. Canada was saved by the courage and faith shown by Sir Charles Tupper on that occasion.

Now, what is the present situation in Canada? In 1898 the Yukon was taken in; in 1905, Alberta and Saskatchewan—Manitoba having come in in 1870. We have, therefore, a country of 3,600,000 odd square miles, the extent of which can be gauged by this fact—that it is more than twice as large as Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Great Britain and Ireland, France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, the Balkans, Greece, Spain aid Portugal—or, in other words, practically all Europe; it is more than double its size. People who are asking for free trade or for protection, as the case may be, apparently do not realize that when this country becomes developed it will be the greatest free trade area, within itself, in the whole world—much greater than the United States as a free trade area. Then what follows from that? Ought we not to cultivate a most thorough interchange of everything in the way of products within our own area?

What have we done? We have set up nine Provinces. In the fetish of provincial autonomy we have succeeded; and while provincial autonomy is a good thing if regulated, we have succeeded in doing what, so far as that great trade area is concerned? If any of you are in such businesses as take you from Halifax to Vancouver you have nine sets of insurance laws; you have nine sets of company laws; you have nine sets of succession duties; you have practically nine sets of commercial laws; and if you attempt to do business you have practically to employ nine lawyers to tell you how you may do it within your own country. (Laughter) That also involves the idea, besides the enormous fetter and shackle it is to trade —and I speak from some practical experience in advising with people who have Dominion-wide trade, who practically do not know where they are at in dealing in the various Provinces—that in each of those Provinces there are various bureaucratic establishments with large staffs of clerks which the taxpayer has to pay for, which wonderfully add to the cost of everything, and that comes out of the customer. So far have they carried the principle that each little local municipality levies, under the guise of a license to trade in its municipality, a fee varying from $100 down, in some cases up to $200, on every person who comes in to solicit orders for business for a person not resident in the town —a type of legislation that is now becoming popular in the West. So that if you have something to sell you pay $100 at a little place of probably 300 inhabitants; then you go six miles further and pay another $100 to a place with another 200 or 300 inhabitants. It is impossible to carry on trade at any reasonable cost under such circumstances.

I do not suggest at all that the Dominion should with a strong hand attempt to regulate this, and to say there should be an absolute freedom of trade throughout the Provinces, without any local interference; but I do suggest that our various Atorneys-General of the various Provinces should devote, say, a week at a time to a conference among themselves, and harmonize the various laws so that they would all agree that Canadians should dwell under practically the same laws in each Province. Let each Province pass the same type of law, so that if you are going to do business in British Columbia or Nova Scotia or elsewhere you can see what your rights are. If they would devote a week of their time to that, perhaps, instead of devoting their time to regulating the conduct of people about affairs which are more or less meddlesome, and which most of us resent, I think it would be a good thing; and I throw out the suggestion to the various Attorneys-General—(applause) for that means some grit that is thrown into the machinery of trade in Canada.

Now let us see what our assets are, because I do not believe that the ordinary citizen ever sits down to realize what a heritage the Fathers of Confederation gave us.

I am not going to indulge in the sort of speech that talks about our wonderful potentialities. I remember in London on one occasion a very gifted Canadian was expounding to an English audience all our possibilities in a rather florid style, and when he paused for breath at one point Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was sitting just near him, said, "Please don't forget our natural gas". (Great laughter). I shall not indulge in any such florid description or statement of our potentialities, but let me draw your attention to what are the four great sources of wealth—the basic sources in this country—and how we stand in regard to them.

First, take agriculture. Do you realize that in the Northwest, in one spot alone, there is a wheat belt 1,000 miles long and 300 miles wide practically unoccupied, the farthest northern portion of which is slightly further south than the most southern portion of the greatest wheat-growing province in Russia, namely, Tobolsk. In other words, they have been growing, and do grow wheat most successfully in Tobolsk in an enormous area further north than the furthest point of that 1,000-mile belt. Take our great Clay Belt, some 16,000,000 acres, into which the settler can go, as our forebears did, and earn their living during the winter in clearing the land, if proper measures are taken for the bringing of his product to the market in the shape of pulp, etc., and in the summer the land that he has cleared will grow crops that are almost beyond the imagination, if one's information is correct as to the fertility of the soil. I need not speak of our agricultural possibilities in Ontario. Take the Niagara district, with its small-fruit possibilities. In

Nova Scotia and New Brunswick there are magnificent agricultural areas, also in Quebec and British Columbia. We have to-day, if you exclude the arid lands and the swamp lands of the United States, a larger habitable agricultural land by twenty per cent. in Canada than they have in the whole United States. That heritage belongs to us, to be developed. I will come to what I suggest ought to be done in regard to its development later on.

Take our next basic source of wealth—timber. Apart from Russia, I think you may say it is unchallenged that we have the greatest natural resources in that direction. We are misusing them most horribly. I will not dwell upon that; that is a wider subject.

Take our mines and our mineral wealth. Every developed mine means railroad earnings; means settlement about it to feed the miners; means an industrious and vigorous population.

Next, and last of all, take our fisheries. The use we are making of them is tragic. (Hear, hear) There are no fisheries in the world comparable to those which we control, and we are absolutely indifferent to the realization of their great wealth. To-day the small towns throughout Ontario, with any sort of storage capacity, could be fed with cheap fish through the whole season; and when I say cheap fish I mean fish at a cheap price but the very best of fish, instead of having to pay anywhere from eighteen cents to forty cents a pound. If we took care of the catch of herrings in Lake Erie, we could have those herrings throughout Ontario the season round by simply putting in such storage capacity as they have in Norway and Sweden, which would not cost a single town in any instance, I think, more than $7,000 to $9,000—a perfect system, which we have neglected, and we have in consequence that enormous waste of fish. And remember, our Great Lakes could be populated with fish at a very small expense, making food for our people at a price that would make Canada a cheap country to live in, so far as that is concerned, and the most healthy food to enjoy. (Applause)

Those are our four great basic industries. What are the problems in dealing with them? The first is immigration; and here I hope that nobody will begin to heave any clubs at me. We have been welcoming the population of South Eastern Europe—to our scaffolds, to our jails, to our hospitals, to our strikes; we have been seeking that population; we have been giving them, before they understood or could speak a word of English intelligently, and therefore before they were able to understand and have explained to them Canadian problems, we have been giving them votes—and their votes are just as good as yours, count for just as much. I see in the morning paper that we are talking of getting some 16,000,000 Englishmen here. How many of those are going to be agricultural laborers? What percentage of them are going to camp out in cities like Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Winnipeg, and stay there, and clamour for unemployment doles such as they got in England, thus adding to your taxes; clamour for State support in various forms, and utterly refuse work on the farms; and who, under the influence of the Hyde Park type of orator who is amongst us, will be apt to clamour for eight hours' pay for four hours' work? (Hear, hear) What immigration has been utterly denied because people did not want their competition — because, so far as I know, they have given eight hours' work for eight hours' pay? I have never known one of them in jail; I have never known one of them attempt to live cheaply when he got money; they are well dressed; they are law-abiding;—I mean the Japanese, that everybody says should not be allowed into this country. They were our great allies in the War. We are going to have to meet that Pacific problem, and, believe me, those people are not going to allow us to assert a superiority under the accident of so-called race which does not exist.

Take the problem of the Northwest so far as domestic considerations are concerned; what is one of the great reasons that people do not settle on farms? Because they cannot get wives and daughters to stand the life. A woman settled on a quarter-section or section has to look after not only her children and the household duties, cooking for her husband and the hired man, but she has to look after the cattle if they have any, and take care of the pigs, etc., and a great many of them die through sheer loneliness and their work. Of course they have the time at their disposal from nine o'clock at night till four in the morning, but apart from that their time is that of the South African slave, and the drudgery of it is so great that you cannot get women to submit to it. What is the remedy? I venture to say you should have from 50,000 to 100,000 of those little brown-faced sturdy Japanese agriculturally-trained labouring girls that would come there at a price that the farmer in the Northwest could afford to pay and they would be glad to accept; who know all about looking after the cleaning out of the stable, feeding the pigs, doing the washing and the rough work of the house, always with a smile on their faces. If you travel in Japan you never see them in any other way than pattering about smiling. You could get 50,000 to 100,000 of those scattered through the Northwest on farms, and if you ever talk about a ray of sunshine in the house, I think the little Japanese domestic servant would bring it.

You cannot get Europeans to go out there and work for them; they want to come into the factories; they want to stay in our towns; they want to see the movies; they want the white light of our streets, and so on; and you will settle very much the problem of people settling in the Northwest if you make the life of the farmer's wife a little more contented, a little more happy, and a little less that of a drudge and a slave.

What is the objection to the Japanese? Don't let them own land until we see what sort of settlers they make, if you please. Don't let them come in in too great quantities. Limit the immigration, say, to 100,000, and when more are wanted, some of those that have been here should go back. I believe they are content with that rotary system, but not content with being shut out altogether. Are they good workers? Are there any better in the world? Are they law-abiding? Are they decent citizens? I think it is bound to be answered every time in the affirmative, that they are. They have made great strides in every direction—scientific, educational, financial and otherwise.

I remember a most amusing conversation I had with the Chief Justice of Japan, in which he pointed out and laid his finger upon the raw in our administration of justice, both our jury system and our non-jury system. They know what they are about. They are a splendid race of people, and I think we are making a great mistake in shutting them out, and we are making it at the behest of what I will presently come to, and perhaps may now come to—I think entirely of certain people who have arrogated to themselves the power that lies in the hands of so-called trade union leaders. (Hear, hear)

There is no more beneficent institution since 1840 in England than trade unions, and the right of collective bargaining, but like many other things that were good, they have been abused; and to-day the type of agitator has got into power who for selfish, irresponsible tyranny beats anything that I know of in the history of the world. (Applause) I would make every trade union have full ability for collective bargaining through its selected officers, but I would see that any trade union that wanted to do collective bargaining was in the same position as a man or corporation that they wanted to bargain with—that they were responsible and answerable if they broke their contract. (Hear, hear) I would insist that they should be incorporated; that they should come under the regulation of the law as other people; and that it should be an offence for them to insist that an employer should have what is called a closed shop. Under the British flag every man has the right, if he behaves himself, to the product of his labour, his skill, his industry and his brains; and I have no right to say to you, "you shall not work while we are in the shop". I can say, "we won't work alongside you," but I cannot stop your employer from saying, "I will give that man work, and I will give it according to the measure of his ability; (hear, hear) and I will give him more if he is able to earn more than another; his wife and family are entitled to his ability, to his earning power." The result of the present attitude of trade unionism is not a dead-sea level of mediocrity—that would be bad enough—but a dead-sea level of what is the lowest minimum of the poorest man in the establishment. (Applause) Gentlemen, it is all wrong, and you may just as well face it.

What is the result? When America got into the war Mr. McAdoo, hoping, as I suggest, that he would get the nomination for the Presidency in succession to his father-in-law made all sorts of concessions to the Federated unions; with what result? To-day the railway problem is the key stone of the vicious arch of the high cost of living. I remember well when men were content with $125 a month who are now drawing $475. Not only were the wages doubled, but the conditions under which they earned them were made so onerous that to-day every farmer who attempts to ship a bushel of wheat or a beef or a lamb to the market is paying from three to four times what he ought to pay because of the extraordinary conditions which have been imposed upon railway companies, and which we, the consumers, are paying for. (Applause) That being the condition, and that enormous vote scattered through the country, we are asked to approve of a policy that would make the life of a government dependent upon how far it yielded to the pressure, the selfish pressure, of high wages on behalf of a particular class, who are a unit in their demand on the general public, a mob that do not know what they want, and yet who are suffering. That is one of the beneficent results of public ownership coupled with public operation.

Another problem, I think, is the merchant marine, in which I believe practically every dollar of money that has been invested will be lost.

Well, are you prepared to instruct the new government to settle the railway problem by facing our losses and taking stock in which they are the sole owners, if you please, in a company, but putting it under corporate management, where a man's skill will get the reward, where everything will not go by mere seniority, and where employment will not be according to whether he and his family have a certain number of votes in the locality in which he resides, and his member therefore insists upon his being put upon the roll? That is the history of the Intercolonial. How this is going to differ in a few years I do not know.

Look at what has happened in Australia. Consult Sir Thomas Tait, who was there managing for seven years, as to how far you can get politicians to keep their fingers off this property which they say "we own on behalf of the people, and we must control; we must have some say about it, because it is not being properly operated."

Now, I think that is all I will have to say on domestic problems. Let me turn for a moment to the outside problems. As I understand it, Lloyd George coined the phrase the other day, "an association of free nations". That is John Bull & Co., like some great departmental store which has its president, that is, the King. I have seen lately an insidious suggestion, timid, apparently under the guise of Canadian patriotism, to assert that we must be thoroughly independent, we must be represented as a separate nation. We have a president, so to speak, of this associated set of nations, John Bull & Co., in the King. If an invitation is sent to the King, as head of the British Empire, to take part in an international conference, the King, just as the President would say, "That is the department that wants to be represented there; you go and attend the conference." What do we want with the conference, suppose it is between Italy and England, with reference to some point about South Africa? We are not interested except in a general way, as other nations are interested. What is it we are complaining of? Has anyone interfered with our management of our own affairs? Starting with the Washington Treaty of 1871, was it not left entirely to Sir John Macdonald to negotiate? Following that, was the Halifax award not left to Sir Alexander Galt?—the Waterways Treaty,—England simply signed her name to what we agreed to. That is the arrangement under which all our disputes, practically are settled with the United States, entirely arranged by ourselves. The Reciprocity Treaty of 1911 was entirely arranged by Mr. Fielding in Washington, without interference by England, although she might have thought herself very greatly interested in seeing if her whole export trade to Canada was to be sacrificed if the treaty went through—I am not saying it would, I merely say she might have thought so. But did she interfere? No, we have been allowed the absolute and untrammelled management of our own affairs. What do we want to be changing it for?

What do we want a representative at Washington for, at an enormous salary, with a whole lot of clerks appointed politically, whom you may find, if you go down there to do business, probably not too attentive to your affairs, and a good deal concerned about their own game of golf, which you are interfering with? (Laughter) What *do* we want? If we have any diplomatic matter to arrange with Washington, the Minister in charge—the Minister of Finance, Minister of the Interior, the Prime Minister, or whoever he may be—has only to step on the train at Ottawa at three in the afternoon, and he is in Washington the next morning for a round-table conference with either the President or the Member of the Government who has the matter in charge—a frank, free, full conference, the only way to arrive at the full facts, because, believe me, when you take to letter-writing with all its keeping of things back, and so on, you get into the old diplomatic state of things where nobody got anywhere except into war.

Do we want a trade representative?

What for?

Do you want some politician who has been appointed from Ottawa at a considerable salary to negotiate your relations with somebody you want to buy goods from or sell them to in the States? Why, you jump on your train and you are in New York or Chicago the next morning; you are in Pittsburg, in Boston, wherever you want to do business, and you do it yourself, I think, a great deal better than through some politician or nominee of a politician who has been appointed as trade representative at Washington.

All this so-called Canadianizing, which means the breaking away from our previous good relations with the Empire and endeavouring to set up a water-tight compartment in John Bull & Co., instead of a partnership of all—a unified Empire—I disagree with, and I entirely reprobate the attempt that has been made to foist a fresh office upon us. And where is the government to end? Once let them extend its salaries and emoluments to Washington and I think we will have it extended to other places, to my mind not doing that much good. (Snapping his fingers, amid applause)

Now, are we prepared to go to the expense? We do not pay a cent of our share of the Imperial expenses. When I was in Japan, over three-fifths of the work of the Embassy there, Sir Claude Macdonald told me, was taken up with Canadian affairs, and we never contributed five cents towards it. We are consumed with this local feeling of attending to our own affairs, but not prepared to pay for it. If we want somebody in the Embassy who is under the Ambassador, have him there, but I see no necessity for it. In the past we have attended to our own affairs absolutely, without interference by the mother country, and under the King. Do we want to gradually sever our relations in that regard?

A great deal of talk is about the Privy Council. I am not disposed here to-day to talk about that, except to say that I think there has been more nonsense through misinformation talked about that than any subject I know of. (Hear, hear) They talk about the poor man being dragged there. I think my friend, Mr. Justice Riddell, will agree with me that he has never seen—I have been going there since 1885, and I have never seen—the plaintiff in a damage suit called on even to argue his case before the Privy Council. You can no more stagger through a claim by a corporation to defeat a judgment in favour of some widow or children against the corporation, you can no more get a hearing before the Privy

Council, beyond listening to you, and when you are through throwing you out of the fifth story window, than you could have a snowball remain in its condition in some place we will not speak of. (Laughter) As to dragging people into litigation, the Privy Council frowns upon any attempt of that kind, and I am bound to say that I have known case after case where the law apparently was with you and the justice was against you, and I have never known a case stagger through the Privy Council against the demands of justice. (Hear, hear) Our courts very often say, "that is the law, and we are bound by it." Try that on their lordships. I remember once a case that I argued where I felt absolutely certain of success, and I think my friend here said I could not fall down and lose it, but Lord MacNaughton said to me, "That is all very well, Mr. Nesbitt, the law of that, but how about the justice of this case? What are the rights of it?" Well, I was a little puzzled about that, because I was not there censoring my client's conduct. It is needless to add we lost that case. I think it is only illustrative of anything I have seen in the Privy Council.

Then it is said, "Why cannot we have just as good men produced here?" Well, we will not discuss that, except to say this: The members of that Privy Council are men who have absolutely world-wide experience. I have seen cases disposed of in one forenoon where they had to dispose of matters of Dutch law, Hindoo law, Moslem law, Quebec law, Isle-of-Man law, Ontario law, and I think Newfoundland law. We have not people with that same wide range of vision, and who probably are able to take the same detached and disinterested view; and certainly in constitutional questions I think we still need the Privy Council to get rid of the more or less friction and jealousy that exists between the provinces and the dominion, and which might at any time lead to a great clash. But apart from accession to the point of view that may be arrived at by the Privy Council, at any rate, it is a great link of Empire; it keeps the uniformity of law which is needed throughout the Empire; and I should be sorry to see any attacks upon it which would mar its usefulness or destroy its existence (Hear, hear)

Now, let me add this. All that I have said leads up to the one point, so far as our external relations are concerned; let us be content to go our ways quietly and slowly. These things take care of themselves. In the war, when it was necessary, without any preconceived plans we were called into the consultations of a War Cabinet. We have our ministers, prime ministers and advisers, and whenever it is necessary we can have a general round-table conference with not only the people of the Mother Country, but with all our associated dominions throughout the world. Let us take it quietly, and not clamour for changes that may or may not be a benefit. Let us have one assemblage of free nations under one king, and let us stay there.

Now, I have got perhaps an interesting little thing for you in an extract I took out of a statement by William Lyon Mackenzie. It would be difficult for the most lukewarm adherent of British connection in this country to cavil at the considered view of William Lyon Mackenzie upon such a point. After his residence in the United States for eleven years, a residence, remember, which he was compelled to take to save his life, he thus speaks of his hopes for the future of the country which had cast him forth. I quote from a communication addressed by him to Earl Grey, at the Colonial Office, on February 3rd, 1849:

> "A course of careful observation during the last eleven years has fully satisfied me that had the violent movement in which I and many others were engaged on both sides of the Niagara proved successful, success would have deeply injured the people of Canada, whom I then believed I was serving at great risks. . . . There is not a living man on this continent who more sincerely desires that **British Government in Canada** may long continue and give a home and welcome to the old countrymen like myself. Did I say so, or ask an amnesty seven or eight years ago till under the convictions of more recent experience? No; I studied earnestly the

workings of the institutions before me and the manners of the people and looked at what had been done until few men, even natives, had been better schooled. The result is, not a desire to attain power and influence here, but to help, if I can and all I can, the country of my birth."

Remember, this is written by a man who had been a constant and most careful observer of the workings of Congress and of the Legislature and of the civic life in the United States for some eleven years, and are the matured reflections of a man who owed nothing except bitter enmity to the people of Canada. If British connection was desirable then, how much more so now, under the progressive and favouring legislation since! (Applause) Now, I trust that our new prime minister, who is his grandson, is fully imbued with the spirit of William Lyon Mackenzie for the preservation of British Government in Canada. (Loud applause)

In conclusion let me say, the fire of patriotism burns in the Dominions with a pure, clear flame which is the wonder of the world. In the great war men from Canada, India, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa and the islands of the sea fought side by side with men from England, Ireland, and Scotland under one flag. With the copious outpouring of their blood they sealed our Empire together. Their blood flowed in the common cause for liberty and justice. Their dead lay cold and stark together. The same tribute is paid for all to the Unknown Warrior, whose last resting place in Westminster represents the burial of the flower of the Empire, an Empire upon which the sun never sets! They fought for the same common flag:

"'Tis but an old bit of bunting,
'Tis but a coloured rag;
But thousands have fought for its honour,
And shed their best blood for the flag."

Let us, the living, see that the common flag continues to wave symbolizing the same common ideals. Let us join in the consummation of a peace where all may labour with equal rights of protection of individual liberty, and justice, for which our Mother Country has ever been famous! I thank you. (Loud applause)

MR. J. MURRAY CLARK, K.C., briefly expressed the thanks of the Club to the speaker for his interesting address.

NEW FORCES IN OLD INDIA

AN ADDRESS BY PROF. SAMUEL L. JOSHI, M.A,
PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH LITERATURE IN BARODA
COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF BOMBAY

Before the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto,
December 15, 1921

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: To-day we have the pleasure again of hearing from India. The gentleman who is to speak to you, Prof. Joshi, is an authority on India, its history, and its present critical situation. I have much pleasure in calling upon Mr. Joshi to speak to you.

PROF. SAMUEL L. JOSHI

Mr. Chairman, my Lord and Gentlemen,—It is a great pleasure to me to stand before you to-day as a humble representative of that part of the British Empire which is really apart from Canada. It is a part of the British Empire which is really much misunderstood by certain sections of the people—I am not talking of Canada, but even amongst the people of England who have a direct contact with the people of India; and I should like to put before you a few facts, first of all with regard to the past history of India, and to show how the forces that worked in the history of the past have been largely responsible for the conditions that are prevailing there to-day.

You are doubtless aware that the history of India goes back several thousand years, and that the ruling people of India to-day, those who are members of the leading castes of Hindoo society, are practically the remnants of that early immigration into India of the Indo-Germanic tribe that went into that country through the north-western part of the Himalayan mountains. It is true that we have been baked in the Indian sun for over 3,000 years, and therefore we have naturally been overtanned (laughter) but the ethnologists will tell you that although we appear to be different as far as the colour of the skin is concerned, the ethnic type of the people of India is quite different from the ethnic type of other Asiatic races, and that it is more closely affiliated with the Anglo-Saxon stock than any Asiatic people .

I should like to emphasize this point at this stage, because I think it is of profound importance in order to realize that although India is a sort of an adopted daughter in the Indian family, she is not altogether a child of total strangers; that there is fundamentally a kinship which may be traced far back into the dim ages of history.

Moreover, India has the unique privilege of possessing the first literature of the Eurasian people, and that literature was couched in the language of the spirit. The greatest religious literature of India, the Vedic hymns, which were composed by the early Indo-Eurasian Indians which were settled in those parts—those hymns strike you as being strangely familiar; and yet when you read the English translation of those Sanscrit hymns from the Vedas you will be struck by the similarity they bear to some of the Psalms of David—indicating in a very clear manner that the early civilization of the people of India was of a deeply spiritual nature. And it is a remarkable fact in history that although a great many of the ancient civilizations of the world have now crumbled into ruin and passed away, that China and India should be the only two ancient civilizations which have survived the shock of change and revolution through so many centuries.

There is another point in this connection that I would like to bring to your attention, and it is this—it was not a mere accident of history that all the great religious systems of the world were born in Asia. A great writer, Meredith Thomson, who is living now, in that remarkable book of his called "Asia and Europe" has, in its preface, made this remarkable statement, namely, that the struggle between Europe and Asia has been the binding thread of history; the trade between Europe and Asia is the foundation of all commerce, and the thought of Asia is the basis of all religion. And this is very clearly proved by the Hindoos in their essential conception of what is meant by culture. The Hindoo idea of culture is profoundly a spiritual idea. The man of culture is supposed to possess that knowledge which enables him to penetrate through the veil to the unrealities of this world, and realize God-consciousness in his soul, the idea being that the human soul is fundamentally a fragment of the universal soul; that the affairs of our earthly life and our fleshly desires spread around the soul a veil of unreality, and the man of culture alone is the man who has the knowledge to penetrate through that veil and realize the God-consciousness.

The people of India have looked upon the founder of Buddhism as the first man of culture—Buddha, the great founder of the Buddhist religion, that great missionary religion of those early days that evolved all those types of religious propaganda which were afterwards repeated in the development of the Christian religion itself, whether you take the mystic element or the monastic type of religion; no matter what phase of Christianity you may study to-day, there is not one of them for which we cannot find a parallel and an origin in the Buddhism of to-day. We have a number of enthusiastic Hindoo missionaries carrying the cause of Buddhism, in those days of antiquity, across the ocean to China, Japan, Korea, Manchuria, and even the frozen ocean of the North.

You will notice, therefore, that along with this concept of culture—namely, the idea of the individual possessing the knowledge to realize God-consciousness in his individual soul—there came to be linked another aspect of culture, and that aspect was largely due to the spread of Buddhism throughout the Asiatic nations. That concept was that of the preacher to all Asiatic nations. In those days Europe was more or less unknown to the people of India, and the only great person from Europe that they had known was Alexander the Great, who had come to conquer India and make it a part of his great Empire. Although he came to conquer, he was in his own turn conquered by the thought of India; and it has been remarked by a great many modern scholars that the philosophy of the people of Greece was largely tinctured by the ideas taken back to Greece by the followers of Alexander when they returned from India; and it has been said that a Hindoo physician was taken by Alexander to his court at Macedonia. Those are all things of ancient times, but they are all profound incidents as we look at the prospects of the twentieth century to-day.

So, with this two-fold aspect of culture, the Hindoos built up civilization on a purely spiritual basis—the Brahmin being the custodian of the spiritual side of life as well as the intellectual. But there came a period when, beside the religious growth, there arose a great outburst of religious activity, and in the sixteenth or seventeenth era there was a flood of writers in India almost as large as the flood of English literature in the days of Queen Elizabeth.

The great poet, Kalidasa, wrote the first Sanscrit play, which has been the forerunner of the greatest in the world; and Goethe is said to have put a copy of that play on his head and started to dance, and when the people wondered at his joy he said, "The last word on the perfection of drama has come to me, not from Europe, but from India." I simply mention these facts to show that the people of India stand on a different pedestal from the other people of Asiatic countries.

There have been a great many changes in the history of the past to which it would not be possible for me to refer in the short time before me. For instance, there was the great Mahommedan contact, which resulted in depriving the Hindoo women of their former liberty, and introducing such customs as early marriage, resulting in physical degeneracy to some extent. Then, the caste system of India has been largely a barrier in their social and political growth, because it introduced the element of division inside the nation.

But the British contact with India begins a new epoch. This contact was originally on a purely commercial basis. You all know the story of the East India Company, how it was formed, and how it started its trade with India, and how ultimately it lent itself to a political organization, and the power was transferred from the private corporation to the British Crown. Now, in this transition there are several points of great interest that we may notice. The time when the Battle of Waterloo was being fought in Europe was the time when great changes were taking place in the economic life of the world. That was the time when India's economic products were much in demand in American and European nations, and Venice was the great emporium of trade which distributed a great many Indian goods and much Indian merchandise.

As a result of the invention of the steam-engine, and the industrial revolution that came into England itself and into other European countries, the whole condition of economic life in India was completely transformed; and so, whereas formerly the people of India supported themselves to a very large extent by weaving their cotton cloth according to the primitive method, now this cotton—which was practically the only artistic product exported out of India—was taken to Lancashire and there woven into cloth, brought back into India, and sold to the people of India. I am merely mentioning the fact which effected the transformation in the economic life of the country; with the result that a great many of the arts of the people of India died, one after another, and India became the coveted market for the manufacturers of England.

There is another point, also, to which I would like to draw your attention—that in the India of to-day there are two kinds of cities. There are the ancient historic cities of India, which had a different origin from the modern cities like Bombay and Calcutta which may be practically called English cities that have been built upon the modern industrial basis of national prosperity; but the old cities of India were originally capitals of old Indian native states where the Indian princes ruled and a great many of the leading artists of the country were patronized by the ruling princes, and art and commerce flourished in these ancient capitals of India. Modern cities like Bombay, however, are of a different type altogether. They represent the imitation of the industrialism of western countries, and the great Nationalist leader in India to-day, Mr. Gandhi, of whom you have doubtless heard, has started a great rational analysis of the whole structure of western civilization from his point of view, an analysis really of great importance to us to-day.

Mr. Gandhi is a man of interest to the people of the world, not necessarily because he is a great Nationalist leader and because of a great deal of unrest to-day, but because he symbolizes the voice of protest against the extreme materialism of the western peoples of Europe. That is why I think I should like to turn my attention for a while to Mr. Gandhi's analysis of western civilization as such.

Mr. Gandhi takes the case of Japan, the youngest member of the Asiatic family, and says that the people of western countries have now admitted her into the family of the great powers of the world because the standards of greatness recognized by western nations are purely physical standards. Japan has adopted the modern methods of destruction of human life; has built great warships; and therefore, because she is physically a menace to the world, she is recognized as a great power. He says that these physical standards of greatness are the ruin of European nations, and he feels that the physical must give place to the ethical if western civilization is to endure.

Mr. Gandhi himself is not a Christian, but he is a great reader of the Bible. The only picture in his unfurnished room is Hoffman's Christ, and the one book that he reads with a great deal of earnestness is the New Testament, particularly the Sermon on the Mount; and he feels that western civilization is going away from Christ rather than approaching Christian teaching; and as the gulf is widening, so also there is a season of universal unrest among the European nations; the industrial situations in the cities of Europe, he says, are merely an index of that unrest. Taking the industrial situation in European cities, he says the everlasting conflict between capital and labour, the discontent which is growing year by year because of the feeling that wealth is not being equitably distributed among the peoples of the world—those are problems not likely to be solved very easily in western countries; and he does not see any sense in the people of India borrowing the civilization in a blind sort of way without really analysing its value from the educational and ethical point of view.

With regard to the political side of European civilization, Mr. Gandhi feels that Machiavelli is the father of western civilization, and not Jesus Christ—and as you all know, Machiavelli was never overburdened with a sense of truth. (Laughter) Some of you probably may recall Sir Henry Wotton's definition of an ambassador in his quaint old seventeenth century dictionary, where he describes the ambassador as "An honest man sent to lie, abroad, for the good of his country." (Laughter)

Now, it is so easy for a man like Mr. Gandhi to become totally pessimistic with regard to the merits of western civilization that I should like to read to you a passage from a magazine I have just received from India which contains the views of Rabindranath Tagore, the intellectual aristocrat of Bengal, giving a different viewpoint altogether from Gandhi as to what he feels about western civilization. Tagore says:

Quotation from "The Young Man of India", November, 1921. Page 519.

"I must not hesitate to acknowledge where Europe is great, for great she is without doubt. We cannot help loving her with all our heart, and paying her the best homage of our admiration—the Europe who, in her literature and art, pours out an inexhaustible cascade of beauty and truth, fertilizing all countries and all time; the Europe who, with a mind which is titanic in its untiring power, sweeping the height and the depth of the universe, won her homage to knowledge from the infinitely great and the infinitely small, applying all the resources of her great intellect and heart in healing the sick and alleviating those miseries of man which till now we were contented to accept in the spirit of hopeless resignation; the Europe who is making the earth yield more fruit than seemed possible, coaxing and compelling the great forces of nature into man's service. Such true greatness must have its motives of power in spiritual strength. For only the spirit of men can defy all limitations, have faith in its ultimate success, throw its search-light beyond the limit of the apparent, gladly suffer martyrdom for effects which cannot be achieved in this life-time, and accept failure without acknowledging defeat.

"In the heart of Europe runs the purest stream of human love, love of justice, of spirit, of self-sacrifice for higher ideals. The Christian culture of the century has sunken deep in her life's core. In Europe we have seen noble minds who have ever stood up for the rights of man irrespective of colour and creed; who have braved calumny and insult from their own people in fighting for humanity's cause and rousing themselves against the mad orgies urged by militarism, against the rage for brutal retaliation or rapacity that sometimes takes possession of a whole people, who are always ready to make reparation for wrongs done in the past by their own nation, and vainly attempt to stem the tide of cowardly injustice that flows unchecked because resistance is weak and innocuous on the part of the injured. There are these knight-errants of modern Europe who have not lost their faith in the disinterested love of freedom, in the ideals which own no geographic boundaries of national self-seeking. Those are there to prove that the fountain-head of the water of everlasting life has not run dry in Europe, and from thence she will have repairal time after time. (Loud applause)

I feel that it is only fair that you should have before you two different views of western civilization, one from Mr. Gandhi, the ascetic, and the other from Rabindranath Tagore, the intellectual aristocrat of India. I do not know exactly where to find the truth between these two different views, and I believe there is much to be said on both sides. I believe there is a great deal of truth in Mr. Gandhi's searching analysis of modern civilization, and there is also a great deal of truth in the good things that Rabindranath Tagore detects behind the spirit of European civilization .

But the great problem that is confronting us to-day is the ultimate destiny of India. As I said to you before, India is the adopted daughter in the Anglo-Saxon Imperial family, and she feels that the time has come when she must be given the same privilege as natural-born children of the Anglo-Saxon mother; and the theory of adoption in India was introduced into Hindoo law as an exact substitute for one of a natural heir, that being the Hindoo feeling in regard to adoption, because India is naturally striving for a footing with the colonies of the British Empire. It is true there are difficulties, from the point of view of Great Britain as well as from the point of view of the people of India; but the difficulties are not of such an insurmountable nature as to hazard the experiment within the doors of the British Government itself, and we have to see what could be done to give a larger measure of self-government to the people of the country.

During the war came the great test for the people of India, and England was watching with great keenness whether India was going to show any signs of disaffection or disloyalty. Emissaries of the German government were busy in India trying to feel the pulse of the people, and even giving hints that the greatest opportunity for India had come to shake off her connection with Great Britain and to accept Germany in the stead of England. But the people of India, whether the extreme politicians, or the moderates, or the loyalists, have all stood firm and said that if they must have a foreign government it must be England and no other. (Loud applause)

The people of India are not blind to the traditions of national freedom which are the special prerogative of the Anglo-Saxon race. We are also grateful to Great Britain for having introduced us for the first time to the theory of western progress—a knowledge of the physical sciences; and the very fact that I am able to address this great gathering here this afternoon is largely due to the fact that the two gifts which England has given to India, and which can never be taken away by anyone, are the English language and the Christian religion. (Loud applause)

When the Indian National Congress of the people of India, the great political body, meets together, with delegates coming from different parts of that Empire, they have no language which they can use as a common medium of conversation, and they are compelled to use the English language; therefore the English language has become one of the languages of India, and I stand before you speaking a language which I am almost tempted to refer to as my mother tongue. (Applause) Therefore I want the people of Canada to realize that India is not so far distant in her mental standing as she may be geographically. There are a great many things in common between the people of Canada and the people of India; and the idealism of India is of great value to the people of the Anglo-Saxon race at the present time. I have given you a sample of that idealism in the quotation I have made from the writings of Rabindranath Tagore. We have had the image of the Imperialistic state, of life over-developed as a result of the great tide of imperial prosperity reaped by the human race in consequence of the powers of steam and electricity; and while we recognize the blessings of steam and electricity as having annihilated space and made all humanity feel its oneness, we realize that there are greater ties that must bind the people of India with the people of Canada. I have already spoken about the ethnic ties, and the old history of India, showing how ethnically we are more closely connected with Anglo-Saxon people than with any other Asiatic race.

I have now to speak to you about the imperial ties; and in this connection I may say that the growth that has been made in education among the leading people of India has really brought into existence a large number of men who are now in a position to undertake responsible duties in that Empire. It is true that primary education has not been pushed among the common people of India so far, and that there is a great deal of illiteracy, and this illiteracy is largely due to the fact that more money is not available out of the Indian revenue for the purposes of popular education. One of the great causes of discontent in India to-day is the fact that the people have no control over their own finances. I think you will all be agreed on this one point, that there is a great deal of force in the demand on the part of the educated people who want to have a voice in controlling their own finances. (Hear, hear)

When Lord Macaulay was laying down the foundation of the British University System in India many years ago he had prophesied, in the British House of Commons, that they were then laying the seeds of a great crop of people in oriental countries who would ultimately seek for themselves the same institutions of freedom which have been the prerogative of the Anglo-Saxon race. Lord Macaulay's prophetic words have come true, and the discontent that you see amongst the intellectual classes of India to-day is not so much a symptom of disloyalty to England, as an index of an increasing vitality and of a greater desire for opportunities for the fuller expression of India's national life.

If time had permitted me I might have shown how apart from the political and economical side of the case, from a purely cultural point of view it is of the highest importance that India should have larger freedom to develop her spiritual heritage of the past under present conditions, and be given a chance for a fresh utterance of her cultural power. Such utterance may be of great service to the world of to-day. We do not know in what way Providence is moving all the different members of the human family, and each nation has to bring its contribution towards the happiness of the human race as such. (Applause) If India, therefore, is struggling to-day for a larger life, and for the opportunity for a larger expression of that life, it is not because she wants to be separated from England—although many of our politicians are now making use of language which in their saner moments they would like to blot out. I feel that the great bulk of the people of India do not want to be separated from the British Empire at all. (Applause) But we do feel, especially those who have had a great deal of English education, that the time has come when the statesmen that are controlling the Indian Empire from the Indian office in London should show a larger spirit of liberality, and deal with the people of India in a more liberal spirit.

I would like to add a word with regard to the great importance that is being attached in India at the present moment to the development of an Indian Christianity. Christianity in India has laboured under very great difficulties. In the first place, it has come to India through European channels, and so an Englishman preaching Christianity to the Hindoo naturally presents Christ more as an Englishman than as an Asiatic; not that the Englishman is to blame, because he does so in the most unconscious manner and with the best of intentions. Moreover, the reproduction of the religious denominations of western countries, again, has given a great deal of alarm to the Christians of India, because Christianity in India has the appearance of a house divided against itself, and the Hindoo people look upon those divided forms of Christianity and say that this is really a reproduction of the caste system of the Hindoos themselves. So we have got to blot out this division in the Church in India as it exists to-day. (Applause)

A great many of the Bishops of the English Church are in full sympathy, therefore, with the work that is being carried on by some Christians of India in the direction of organizing an Independent Indian Church; and it is with that object in view that the Bishop of Bombay and some other friends have sent me to this country and to the United States to interest the people on this side of the Atlantic Ocean in the great work that Indian Christians themselves are struggling to do in the organization of an Indian Christianity, because that may be the ultimate outcome of the present situation in India. As between England and India there is no doubt that, apart from the interests of the British Empire, the Empire of Jesus Christ has a claim on the larger attention of every one of us here (applause); and when strong men meet strong men and cannot come to any rational ground of compromise you will find that invariably they will find the solution of their problem in the teachings of Jesus Christ. If we would only open our eyes and not be nervous about talking in a religious tone, but realize that the greatest realities of life are to be found in the teachings of Christ, and seek to extend those teachings to all the relations of life, I think that would be the only way for us to recover the key to lost happiness. (Applause) I feel that the Christians of India have a great work to do in bringing about a true compromise between the British Government on one side and the Hindoo and Mahommedan people on the other; therefore it is that I want to present to you the great importance of the work that we are struggling to do as Indian Christians in that Empire. (Loud applause)

PRESIDENT MITCHELL: In previous addresses on India we have had the commercial, the military, the legal and the educational points touched upon. To-day we have the ethical, the esthetic, the cultural ,and the religious. I am sure I express the sentiments of this Club when I say to Professor Joshi that we are very much indebted to him for his address, that we are very much pleased and gratified, and that we wish him all success. (Hearty applause)

BUSINESS MEETING

MR. FEATHERSTONHAUGH said that according to the constitution the Annual Meeting of the Club must be held on or before the 15th of December, and as this was quite impossible without the aid of the secretary, who was unable to be present, he therefore moved that this be considered the Annual Meeting, and that the said meeting be adjourned until a day set by the Commtitee.

MR. WILKINSON, Vice-President, seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously.

"EMPIRE PROBLEMS OF TO-DAY"

An Address by GENERAL, THE EARL OF CAVAN, K.P., G.C.M.G., K.C.B.
at a Dinner given in his honour

The Empire Club of Canada, Toronto,
December 19, 1921

President Mitchell: *My Lord and Gentlemen,* — I have the distinguished honour to-night to introduce as our guest a great Empire soldier. (Applause) He comes to us with a wealth of experience and a wealth of memory after five years of the Great War, and three years, that have since elapsed. For the last six weeks he has been in Washington at the Disarmament Conference. During the five years of the War Lord Cavan rose from a high rank at the start to a very high rank at the end. In September and October, 1914, during the first battle of Ypres, he commanded the Guards Brigade; through those difficult times of 1915 he commanded the Guards Division, and through the more difficult times of 1916 and 1917 he commanded the 14th corps—that famous corps in which the Guards Division was always present. Later in 1917 and 1918 he commanded the British Troops in Italy, and finished the war in a blaze of victorious glory on the Pavla and the Coronado. (Applause) The Empire and Canada and Toronto and this Club cannot be too loud in their praise of his achievements. (Applause) And now, with his work at the Disarmament Conference of which he is going to speak to-night, I am sure we realize that Lord Cavan has much more indeed to do for the Empire in the years that are ahead of him for Lord Cavan is more than a soldier; he is a statesman. I have much pleasure indeed in calling on Lord Cavan to speak. (He was received with prolonged cheering.)

LORD CAVAN

General Mitchell and Members of the Empire Club,—It is a real privilege to me to address a Club with that glorious name; still more a privilege to see men of Canada that I love, and always have loved intensely—and I do not say it because I am here, for I adored it in 1891—92, when I was younger than I am now, and it is an honour to be here, and I am grateful to you, Gentlemen, for giving me the honour.

Now, a word or two before I begin the large, very large subjects, about what is not a very small subject—that of your President. Your President was with me as Intelligence Officer after General Plumer left Italy in March, 1918, until the end of the war; and it was what he found out about the enemy that enabled me to hit him in the right place. (Applause) I have no hesitation in saying—and I am quite sure that Lord Plumer would back me up when I say—that there was no more intelligent or loyal Intelligence Officer in the whole of the armies of the Allies than your President. (Loud applause)

A great opportunity was afforded by this Conference at Washington to soldiers and sailors of the Empire to come and visit Canada; and the extraordinary thing is that what brings us here, although we are soldiers and sailors, is not war but peace. Now, that in itself is somewhat extraordinary.

There was a time, not long ago, when only statesmen realized responsibilities of the state that they governed. Now-a-days we are moving a long way forward from that, and it is your responsibility, Gentlemen, to look after the safety of the state you live in; not only that, but of the Empire; and I want particularly to impress upon you that everybody has his share in formulating the policy of the country. That being so, I have deemed it of interest to tell you, as far as I can, the commitments that all we members of the British Empire have to fulfil at this minute. They are larger, perhaps, than some of you may imagine.

Let me first go a little backwards and tell you that at the time of the Crimean War, Canada did not have Responsible Government; at least I do not think that was granted until 1860, although Canada was re-united in 1848—you must forgive me if my history is wrong. At any rate, in the Crimean War you sent a very charming message to Great Britain, and you said this: "If you have to withdraw your troops from Canada we are ready to look after ourselves; and meanwhile here is a nice cheque for your widows and orphans." (Applause) Well, that is a long time ago, but that was a fine start for cementing the Empire. I am not going to dwell on all that happened between then and now, but I may just remind you that in the Indian Mutiny you took a still further part and you raised a regular regiment and gave it into the British Armies. That regiment was the Hundreth Prince of Wales Royal Canadian Regiment (applause) now known as the 1st Battalion, as the Prince of Wales Lancaster Regiment of Royal Canadians. That was your part in the Mutiny—which was an advance on the cheque. (Laughter) That battalion was 1,200 men.

We then go on to South Africa—figures I have none, but the part you took I know.

We then pass on to this War, and in one word, 466,000 Canadians voluntarily offered their services to the Empire. (Applause)

The writer of a book published, I believe, only last week, which reviews the services of all the branches of the British Empire, the one to the other, throughout the last 200 years, said this: "It is the glory of the British Empire that war has shaped its course not by riveting an iron yoke upon unwilling subjects, but by creating a sense of partnership, joint responsibility and mutual confidence." (Applause)

So much for past history, Gentlemen, which is dull, very dull. We will turn now to more modern times, and I would like to tell you now of what Great Britain has undertaken (since the War) and is carrying out. I will show you, as I pass from one to the other, what I think are possible danger-spots, so that you may realize them in the next place in which you meet them—but I pray God you won't have to, though you might come and say, "Hello, you are getting into a mess; here we are again." (Applause)

The responsibilities of Empire at this minute, Gentlemen, are 6,000,000 square miles, and a population of 47,000,000 whites and 390,000,000 coloured people. That is what you have got to look after, in area and population; and to do it you have got 250,000 men.

Now, the first commitment, to which we are bound by the Versailles Treaty, is the bridge-head that we achieved on the Rhine at Cologne. We are holding that, according to the Treaty, for fifteen years, or less if Germany shows that all is well and she is not going to fight any more. But at present there are about 9,000 troops there, including a detachment that is up in Silesia under General Henniker, which I am told is doing extraordinary work, but you can judge for yourselves, because you have the Pole against the German, and the German against the Pole, and both against the French, and the French not quite sure, really, for the moment, whether they like this new boundary in Silesia or not. Yet there has not been a single misdemeanour of anybody shooting anybody else, certainly for the last four or five months; so that order has been kept there quite wonderfully by this very small detachment.

On the Rhine I am told that everybody is extraordinarily happy; and I am told that as the Germans have to pay all soldiers on the Rhine of the late Allies in the rate of exchange of that country's money, an American private soldier on the Rhine receives a larger salary than the Prime Minister of Germany. (Great laughter)

We will now pass to Turkey. In Turkey an old friend of yours, Sir Charles Harrington, is in command of Allied troops—French, Italian and British—of which he has 12,000, roughly. His duties are to ensure the freedom of the passage through the Dardanelles; to do anything he can to protect Christian people in Turkey, and at present, if he can, to make peace between Turkey and Greece—and various other little duties like that. (Laughter)

Well, that situation is extremely complicated by this fact—that there is a Sultan in Constantinople with some Pashas and people that he calls the Government of Turkey; and there is in Angora, in the very centre of Asia-Minor, another Government under Mustef Kemel, which has all the power and I believe most of the votes, and they call themselves the Turkish Government. Therefore, Gentlemen, we shall have to look for a solution of the question, if anybody will give it to us for we want it badly—which Government we are going to make peace with, without offending the other. (Laughter) There is a certain number of Indian troops, as well as British, in Constantinople; whether we shall ever be able to get them away, as we hope to do very soon, it is quite impossible to say.

I will now turn to Egypt. An honourable effort has just been made by the Cabinet at home on the one side with a gentleman called Adela Pasha on the other, to come to a mutually friendly understanding with Egypt, to do away with the word "protectorate," and practically to give them almost entirely the independence that they ask for. But we said we must hold the Suez Canal. We also said, "We don't think that you Egyptians are yet capable of keeping the Soudan in order. We also want to ensure everybody freedom, so that European business people there, white people, don't have their throats cut; and for those three reasons we want to keep some troops there, anyhow for a time." Well, the other gentleman says he does not like that, and at present this offer is rejected. Well, Gentlemen, it does not want telling that the Suez Canal is vital to the Empire. (Hear, hear) As a soldier I certainly hope that we shall not budge one inch from the position we have taken up, of keeping troops to guard the Suez Canal at any rate, whatever may be settled about the Soudan and the poor white people whose throats may be cut. For everything in Egypt we keep, roughly, about 17,000 British and Indian troops.

I will now go on to Palestine. We did not ask for Palestine, but by the treaty of Versailles we accepted the mandate for it. The mandate means that we go there; we don't own the country; it has nothing to do with us; but we have to get and keep order in it, get a good Government in it, do what we can to put it on its feet, and then go away as soon as possible. (Laughter and applause) Now, the situation in Palestine is roughly this: On the north we are safe; the French have a mandate north of Damascus, about Syria and along the Baghdad Railway, and they keep us from any bother from the north. In Palestine itself the Arabs and the Jews are being slowly taught by the British to live side by side in peace. They don't like each other a bit; if they get half a chance they go for each other, and therefore there is no possible chance of our getting away until they do learn to like each other. Then, on the other side of the River Jordan, Trans-Jordania—are a lot of Arab troops who are at present friendly enough, but they are difficult to control, and I am perfectly certain that if we went out of Palestine at once, those Arab troops would come in at once and there would be very few Jews left. So that our commitments in Palestine, you see, are pretty serious, and we have to keep, roughly, about 7,000 British and Indian troops located up there.

We now come to Mesopotamia, where we have gone some distance in establishing the country, because we have made an honest really all-round effort to establish good Government, and we put a gentleman called Fisal on the throne there, or we might say, perhaps, back on the throne in Baghdad on which he was enthroned by the good-will and the vote of the Arab tribes all round, and it was a great success, and we hope that very soon he may be able to govern his country in a satisfactory manner. We had reduced the garrison there very considerably up to 1920, when all of a sudden there was one of those wild out-breaks, and large reinforcements had to be sent, and that was very quickly and very well quelled by General Haldane, and now we are in process of reducing again.

I told you I would show you the danger spots, and I want to conceal nothing; and here may I just show you a possibility—I hope not a probability—but this is the situation there. You know the north portion of the Gulf. At the north of the Persian Gulf is Basra; 400 miles due north, a little bit west, is Baghdad; 400 miles again north of that is Mosul. We occupy Mosul and Baghdad, but our lines of communication are 800 miles long, partly by rail, partly by the Tigris or Euphrates—I forget whether it is the Tigris or Euphrates, but it doesn't matter; it is the upper river. Anyway, Gentlemen, that is not a very good military position. Those of you who have been soldiers would agree with me in that, I am sure; and if you have a long-strung-out position like that, the sooner you concentrate the better. I won't go further than that. Well, now, to guard all that large country we have to keep a very large number of men, but that number is being reduced, as I told you, and if only Fisal proves himself a good king of the Arabs there we hope that our commitments will not be so great as they are at this minute.

And now one word about India. We leave out of the question the coast line, which is Admiral Beatty's job, and not mine, but it has got a frontier, called the Northwest frontier, of 500 miles. Along the whole length of that are tribes, quiescent at times, wild at times—a very difficult country to hold satisfactorily. The use of airplanes has not helped us very much because you can imagine—those of you who fly—that it is not a very good place for landing. (Laughter) The treaty with the Ameer of Afghanistan that took nine months to get, has just lately been signed, and I hope very much that he will be as loyal as his predecessor was some years ago, and that that treaty may show the troops along the northwest frontier that the Afghan trusts us, and that therefore it is better policy for them to keep quiet.

You know the situation inside of India, Gentlemen. India is in the process of learning to govern itself. Great strides have been made—fine, noble strides—but with that country teeming with millions of people of different religions, it is not very easy to get what we know as stable Government, Government selected properly, generally with a certain amount of persuasion going on. There is a gentleman there called Gandhi whom we allow to speak as he likes; and sometimes he says quite nice things, sometimes he says very dangerous things. The other day when the Prince of Wales went to Allahabad, you saw what happened; he was received with absolute silence. Well, now, Gentlemen, you can read through the lines of that. That shows discipline on the part of Mr. Gandhi's followers. When you see that, be careful. There is the danger spot. I hope and pray nothing will happen; that all will pass off all right. I am quite sure the Prince of Wales will be all right—convinced of it—but the situation in India is disquieting. That is another great commitment of Empire.

Well, Gentlemen, so much for your commitments overseas. They are yours as well as mine; we have all got to take our share and our interest in those things. (Hear, hear)

Now, may I turn to the brighter side of the picture, perhaps, where on this side of the world efforts are being made for peace. I have said four times already in Canada, and I am now going to say it for the fifth, that two things stick right out in that Washington Conference; the first is honesty of purpose, and the second is determination to achieve. (Loud applause)

With regard to the former—honesty of purpose—I came over in the ship with Mr. Balfour. We had no idea whatever how the Washington Conference would open, how the question of limitation of armaments—not disarmament—was to be approached. Gentlemen, may I give you just a word-picture of that Conference room, so that you may realize more or less what it is? Imagine a table arranged like this, one down there and one down there; Mr. Hughes, Secretary of State of the United States, sits in the centre; two American Delegates, Senator Lodge and Mr. Root, sit at his right. Next to them Mons. Briand, who has now gone home, but whose place was taken by Mons. Viviani, and now his place is taken by Mons. Sorault, representing France, further on the right. Around the corner, the junior French Delegates. Next to them Japan, and next to them, around the corner again, China. Next to them, Portugal, Belgium, Italy, Great Britain—the Empire delegates of Canada, Australia and New Zealand first, and coming around to Mr. Balfour on Mr. Hughes' left. That is how they sit; and behind them in blocks the secretaries, naval and military advisers and others, exactly behind their own countries. There are galleries in which sit the Senate of the United States and their friends; the President's box; the Vice-President's box; and another room for visitors. It is a magnificent hall, and the whole atmosphere is marked by sincerity and earnestness.

When we went into that first conference Mr. Hughes made that world-famous speech in which—this is exactly what happened—America had a building program of capital ships extending up to the year 1925 which would have put her in a position of vast superiority at sea over anybody; I do not think it possible that any other country could have afforded to keep pace with that program. Mr. Hughes proposed that the whole of that program—the whole number, including two ships 90 per cent. completed—should be immediately scrapped; nothing more to be heard of them at all. Having made that offer of what the United States were prepared to do he said, "Will you meet me?"

Great Britain took a week to think it over. They said they accepted the principle, and they took a week to work it all out. Admiral Beatty was there, and worked it out with his naval advisers of Great Britain, and accepted on behalf of the British Empire. (Applause) Your own Delegate, Sir Robert Borden raised no objection whatever of any sort or kind; the same with Australia, the same with New Zealand and the Delegates from Great Britain.

Japan honestly said, "I don't like the proposed ratio." They did not go back to Japan, accept it, and then say, "The United States has put this all over us." They said "We don't like it; we would like to argue it out"—

straightforward. It was argued out; various telegrams passed, and the Tokio government accepted the ratio proposed, of 5-5-3. It simply means this, that America had, we say, 15 ships, Great Britain 15 ships, Japan 9 ships. Japan honestly said they must keep the Mutsu, which is the most magnificent ship afloat at this minute, the very newest, because her statesmen said they could not bring home to their people the necessity of destroying a practically new ship that was just being launched. This was considered reasonable, and the ratio is preserved by America keeping the two ships that were 90 per cent. complete and Great Britain having leave to commence work on two super-Hoods, the Hood being the latest ship, in fact the only absolutely post-Jutland ship that we have got. That, I understand, is perfectly satisfactory to every member of the British Empire delegation .

So far, so good. Now comes the question of France and Italy, which for the moment is doubtful. But I may say, from my experience on this Commission, that whatever the argument may be, and even if they get a little bit heated, that Mr. Hughes in the chair will bring the debaters back on to the high line; that is to say, he will remind the Delegates that the Conference was called for limitation of armaments, and not for increases of armaments. Well, Gentlemen, we pass on to China. There are great and many difficulties connected with Chinese questions. The first was a very long word called extra territoriality—which meant that various nations had acquired parts of China in various ways, and China would be very glad if they would be restored to her. Well, it is almost incredible, but it is true that Japan gave up Shantung; that Great Britain gave up Wi-Hai-Wei; and that France gave up Kiao-Chaou—almost just because China said she would like them back. (Laughter) Well, Gentlemen, that is a marvellous achievement. (Applause)

Then we come to fortifications in the Pacific. It is a very intricate question, that—very much more intricate than I can attempt to explain to-night, because the mandated territories in the Pacific—that is, the distribution of islands that were German—are drawn on lines of latitude and occasionally longitude, and it is extremely difficult, really, except by looking at the map, to say where somebody's mandate ends and where somebody's mandate begins; and the question of fortifying these islands was a very, very nasty one, and looked as if it must make for war in the future. What happened there?—a practically unanimous agreement not to fortify any island at all in the Pacific for ten years. (Applause) Now, that, Gentlemen, is also a wonderful achievement, I think. (Hear, hear) If the Conference ends with the naval ratio settled and the ten-year holiday, and the peace of the Pacific—practically a third of the globe-assured for ten years, I do not think anybody can say that the Washington Conference was in vain. (Applause)

Just one word more, if you can bear with me, before I finish. (Voices—"go on!") There are a few more difficult questions left—land armaments, laws of war, gas, aeronautics, bombing of undefended towns—I just mention a few—(A voice "Submarines") Well, now, Gentlemen, I think I am right in saying—though I am not quite sure about this—that it is practically decided that nine nations of the earth cannot attempt a solution of these questions; they must be left until some other time, when I hope with all my heart that this great example will be followed, and that another conference representing all the fighting nations of the earth, including our late enemies and Russia, will assemble somewhere and get to work to thresh out these difficult questions; and if you cannot arrive at conclusions, place the reasons why you cannot, open to the world, and let the world make up its mind whether or not it is possible to make laws on these subjects—for that, as Mr. Root said the other day, is the method of progress. (Applause)

I thank you very sincerely, Gentlemen, for listening to me with such attention; and I only hope that if I have said anything indiscreet I may be forgiven. (Loud applause, the audience rising and cheering)

President Mitchell asked Rev. Dr. Cody to express the thanks of the Club to the Speaker of the evening.

REV. DR. CODY

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I have very great pleasure in discharging the task laid upon me, and moving a cordial vote of thanks to General, the Earl of Cavan for his illuminating and lucid address to-night. When distinguished administrators or soldiers or sailors from the motherland come to this continent, we in Canada do hope always to have a glimpse of them. (Hear, hear) We are glad that Lord Cavan and Colonel Bartholomew have managed to steal away from the important deliberations at Washington and given us the pleasure of meeting them, and give us in Canada the opportunity of hearing at first hand what are the real trends of events in connection with the Washington Conference. Lord Cavan may be very sure that such an envoy of Empire as he is, still further strengthens the bonds, fine as silk but stronger than steel, that bind us all together. I am sure, Sir, it came to us all with a fresh meaning that the old Empire is an unwearied Titan, and still bears burdens for the whole world. (Hear, hear) She has borne no small share of the white man's burden in the past, and we are not self-righteous, nor do we congratulate ourselves too much, when we say that in the main she has borne those burdens for the good of those who were burdened. She has sought to be a trustee of all that is noblest in the history of the race, so that those less favoured may rise in the scale of political being, and enjoy some measure of the freedom and justice and honour that we think we possess! We are glad to welcome Lord Cavan; glad to know that one of the greatest soldiers of the war is not only a scientific master of rightful destruction for a worthy end, but is a statesman of construction who looks forward to a purer and nobler and saner and more peaceful world. (Applause) He will be very welcome in Canada whenever he returns, and I am sure he will take back to Washington and back to the world's metropolis—for London still is the world's metropolis, (loud applause) the assurance that Canada does intend, to the measure of her strength, to realize not only the privileges but the responsibilities that come to her in virtue of her new status. We cannot claim to be a nation, even within the Empire, unless we are prepared to make the sacrifices that such status involves. (Loud applause) Every part of the Empire, particularly the great self-governing nations within the Empire, has its own peculiar problems, and I know Lord Cavan will recognize some of the peculiar problems with which we in Canada are faced. We are side by side with a nation outnumbering us twelve to one, a nation with whom we have tremendous financial and commercial dealings, a nation with whom we live on most friendly terms, a nation to whose members we are related by many ties of blood and marriage, a nation whose influence, through the very bulk of it, we cannot escape; and yet we do not intend in Canada to be only a pale shadow of our great friendly brothers to the South. (Loud applause) We do feel that we have a mission to fulfil in the world; that we have to beat geography, and war against that great Laurentian wedge that divides the east from the west, and that we must hang together, or we will hang separately, and that we want, as an integral part of the great British Commonwealth, to do our share of the world's work. (Hear, hear) It will need all our wisdom and all our patience and all our tolerance and all our willingness to understand the diverse points of view, to act together, work together, and to be an efficient force together for the British Commonwealth, and through that Commonwealth for the whole world. We want our friends in the United States to remember that Canadians believe they can do a far better work in friendly co-operation with the United States, as a part of the British Empire, than ever we could do as an absolutely independent republic. (Applause) In my humble opinion there never was a time in all the history of Canada when national spirit was so high, and when Canadians were such tremendous Canadians, and at the same time such tremendous Britons. (Applause) I have the greatest pleasure in moving the hearty thanks of this Club to Lord Cavan for his splendid address tonight. (Loud applause, the audience rising and giving three cheers and a tiger)

President Mitchell welcomed the members of the Young Men's Canadian Club who were present in cooperation with the Empire Club.

A SURVEY OF THE EMPIRE: ITS PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

AN ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. C. H. MITCHELL, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., PRESIDENT OF THE EMPIRE CLUB,

At the Annual Meeting, January 12, 1922.

Gentlemen,—I suppose that in some ways, it is hardly fitting that the President of a Club like this should take upon himself the prerogative of speaking on such a large question; but yet I have felt that, with the advantage which we have had here during the past year and the year before, of hearing a number of eminent speakers from all parts of the Empire logically and in sequence describe the problems which are before us in different parts of the Empire, we do feel a certain degree of familiarity with the problems and the prospects of the Empire as it is to-day. For myself, I have had the good fortune at various times, in the last few years to have a certain degree of contact with gentlemen who have to do with affairs of the Empire and who have been doing things in the Empire; and perhaps that advantage has had some reflection in my own views, which I may be permitted to pass on to you in a very general and imperfect way.

It is a pretty hard thing to compress into the allotted time for the speaker at Club meetings, a trip around the Empire. We will have to take a sort of aeroplane photograph as we pass by, to thus present to you several features in each part of the Empire.

I want to start by a quick run over to the old country, with which you are so familiar. I want to take you across the Atlantic, up the Mersey to Liverpool, and then down to London and to Euston Station. Many of you have done that just as I have described; then you have come down from Euston to Trafalgar Square, then along the

Strand, and then down to St. Paul's, the heart of Empire, then to the Bank and the City—and, thank God, it is still *The* City in the British Empire, and it is still the centre of the finance of the world.(Hear, hear and applause) Then I want to take you into the Mansion House, and back along the embankment up to the Houses of Parliament to hear Big-Ben strike 12 o'clock noon, and then up Whitehall past the War Office and the Admiralty, then up Piccadilly, down to Buckingham Palace, and back across the green park to the Ministers and to Downing Street. And then I want to introduce you to that grand old man, Lloyd George, (applause) and remind you of the book called "The Mirrors of Downing Street", written by an unknown author not long ago. When you read that, as many of you have done, you realize what the problems and the prospects of the Empire have been and are to-day.

The problems of Great Britain are very much the problems of the Empire, and in the last two years Lloyd George and those splendid men beside him have had to wrestle with the problems of internal affairs at home as well as external affairs abroad. They have had to work out the problem of the unemployed and the unemployable. They have had to work out the problem of the poor; and you know there is a programme now in Great Britain, mostly in England, for building 200,000 houses to help out the housing of the poor. Then there has been the problem of re-establishing trade, and the questions of efficiency and work hours, and the pet question of pay without work, which perhaps has been one of the greatest difficulties they have had to deal with in the old country.

Then we must go over to Ireland. I do not know what one can say. One could say a great deal; perhaps the least said the better at the moment; but this we do realize that, notwithstanding the difficulties which there have been in the last few months, it looks very much now as if the end were in sight and a fairly peaceable solution is being worked out. What the next few months will bring, who can tell? But, after all, we do realize that the problem of Ireland is largely a problem of what the Irish people make it themselves. (Hear, hear) Everybody agrees that Great Britain and the Empire at large has done everything — more than everything — to help them from the outside, and I suppose they are making up their minds; but who is going to say that they will be satisfied after they have done so? It rather reminds me of the story—this time of a Scotchman who had always been grousing during his life-time, and when finally he died and had gone to Heaven he was met by his friend Donald on the golden streets, who came up to him in great glee and said, "Well, Sandy, surely you are happy now, you have got everything you want; no more grousing from you?" With that Sandy looked dourly at him and, pulling off his halo, said, "Well, noo, do you ca' that a fit?" (Laughter)

Then there has been in England and the Empire generally, the whole question of the re-establishment of our commercial supremacy. Anyone who has followed the situation during the War and after cannot help but feel that the political considerations which have to be met in the old country and in the Empire are largely and inseparably connected with the question of economics.

In October Mr. Lloyd George introduced in Parliament perhaps one of the most constructive measures which has been presented for some time, at any rate since the War. Much is hoped for. It is difficult to foresee what may come out of it. That legislation you will all remember, was, first, relief work on a large scale which he proposed to carry out to take the place of those payments to the out-of-works who were being paid without doing any work. The second was his arrangement for getting suitable men out of the country and into the Overseas Dominions and getting them settled on the land. We have heard of that before in Canada; while that would apply, of course, to Canada I think it is mainly designed for Australia. The third thing which he proposed was what he called export credits, for the purpose of enabling industrial and commercial concerns in the old country to deal with the overseas dominions through the help of loans, moneys advanced to them by the Imperial Government. It is pretty hard for us at this distance to see just how that may work out. Undoubtedly it will help them in the old country, and it will doubtless help us here; but the great point about it and about those various measures that he did bring out was this—that if we are going to export from the old country and interchange with the overseas dominions, men on the one hand and capital on the other, it will help not only the old country itself but the overseas dominions as well. (Applause) I want to pass on to you the expression he used—that credit is oxygen for trade; not its food, but its energizer. Those of us who are in business know what that means.

I spoke a moment ago about the War Office. Using that term in the broadest sense, as applying to the whole British Imperial Army and its military operations, I suppose that the work done by the War Office was just as fine as we could get out of the capabilities and efforts of the British Empire, out of the quality of our courage, the quality of our people and their efficiency. Speaking of that effort, I will never forget one day in September, 1918, when I was back in England on leave from Italy. I went into the Imperial General Staff Offices to talk with my old chief, General Harington. He was by himself in a room nearly half the size of this and appeared in the best of spirits. In his great enthusiasm, walking up and down he said—using his old expression—"Mitch, we are fighting to-day on twenty-two fronts." Now, Gentlemen, that is the measure of the British Empire. (Applause) The following Spring, when I happened to come in again, sometime in May, 1919, after the peace, after Versailles, he did the same thing, but not quite in the same way. He said, "You know, to-day we are still fighting on six fronts in Russia alone." And since that time we have continued fighting—not any of our making at all—but we have had to do it on twice that number of fronts I suppose, in eastern Europe and in central Asia. That is the measure of the effort which the British Empire has put forth from the heart in London, from Whitehall and Downing Street. Just in passing I want to bring to your attention the fact that within the last week we have received news that Lord Cavan, our old friend who spoke to us at the last meeting of this Club, has now been appointed Chief of the Imperial General Staff to succeed Sir Henry Wilson. (Applause)

It is an easy thing to turn for a moment to what has been happening down in Washington—Washington with its Limitation of Armaments Conference. You may remember that Lord Cavan, when he was here the other day, corrected the expression we had used at the meeting of the Empire Club by saying, "It is not a Disarmament Conference, it is a conference for the Limitation of Armaments." You will remember what Lord Cavan said was expected to be the outcome of the Conference at Washington. At that time there was great hope, and notwithstanding what we have since heard and read, there is still great hope, when one considers the great effort that is being made, genuinely being made, by the people who are there by the unity of purpose, by the desire to get on with it and get through with it, by the desire to get everybody together. That unity of purpose is most exemplified, I think, in the attitude of the British who, I found when I was at Washington a few weeks ago, are the ones who are unifying that conference, who are taking the others sympathetically by the arm and saying, "Come on, let us get on with it." They are the ones who have been trying and have succeeded in getting discordant notes toned down and discordant feelings smoothed out, and the ones who are really the energy behind the conference to get everybody into line as only Anglo-Saxons can. (Applause)

Now then, for the Empire around the world. It is not a question of armament now; it is not the question of disarmament; it is a question of how we are going to ensure the peace. It is a question of how we are going to get on now with the business of the Empire; and if there is any one thing that comes out of this Armament Conference at Washington it will be that it will ensure to the British Empire, to the Anglo-Saxon people, and to the world, a respite of peace, and an assurance that during the next ten years we are going to be able to get on with our ordinary business and will be through with this bickering and strife over things that are not real business. The business of the Empire is our trade and our commerce on the seven seas; and to Canada, the golden link, how much does that mean to us? How much does that mean to the various parts of the Empire? Empire trade and the seven seas! I would like to read two or three stanzas of that splendid poem written by Rudyard Kipling twenty years ago—

THE SEVEN SEAS

"Our brows are bound with spindrift and the weed is on our knees;
Our loins are battered 'neath us by the swinging smoking seas.
From reef and rock and skerry—over headland, ness and voe—
The Coastwise Lights of England watch the ships of England go."

"Come up, come in from Eastward, from the guardports of the morn!
Beat up, beat in from Southerly, O Gipsies of the Horn!
Swift shuttles of an Empire's loom that weave us main to main
The Coastwise Lights of England give you welcome back again!"

"Go, get you gone up Channel with the sea crust on your plates
Go, get you into London with the burden of your freights!
Haste, for they talk of Empire there, and say, if any seek,
The Lights of England sent you and by silence shall ye speak!"

That was more than twenty years ago. It is more so to-day with the war and all its five years behind us.

Now, for our quick journey through the Empire. Let us start off from the old country to the Mediterranean, stopping a moment at Malta, and remember that the grand old man that is living there and running that little rocky islet is our old friend Lord Plumer of Messiers. Let us remember that within a year after he got there, with the assistance of Colonel Amery, who was here with us last year and who is almost a Canadian, they gave to the Maltese their first constitution; and that act is just about as good an indication of the tendency of the times in the Empire as anything could be, because the note today throughout the British Empire in all its various parts is the note of autonomous government; and that little island has now its own government, but under the control and under the advisement of the British.

Now to Egypt. I can only take a few minutes with each of these eastern countries because you will remember the various addresses we have had recently. Egypt, as far as we are concerned, started its history after our war in 1882. During the last few years the British have endeavoured to govern the country, and to give the Egyptians a species of responsible government in which their own people were assisting. But there came an unrest following after the war, which culminated in 1919, and the result of it has been that difficulties have arisen with regard to this very point of autonomous government, and as recently as last summer the commission of Egyptians went to England to try to arrange the details of that autonomous government. Unfortunately they have come back without the arrangement completed, and the whole thing appears to be condensed down to a situation similar in some respects to that in Ireland, wherein they are quarreling among themselves, not with the British, as to how they are going to have their government arranged. This trouble, which caused great difficulty last month in Egypt, one can easily see is not directed against the British. The British are simply the pulse of the country. The trouble lies between two factions, the extremists and the moderates of the native people. Now, with the efforts the British are making, given time, given coolness, given everybody's co-operation, in due course they will undoubtedly get sorted out, and these troubles will disappear.

Now with regard to Palestine, which is next in the chain. Palestine fell to us as a legacy arising out of the war. I don't think anyone will say it was of our seeking, or that we tried a process of alienation. Our enemies may say so, but undoubtedly the end of Turkish rule has come in Palestine, and that is what everybody wanted. While speaking of that, I would like to divert for a moment. I don't think any incident connected with that country struck me so much as in 1918 when I was in London on leave, and several of us were walking through the old Middle Temple—the Law Courts. In the old church, in which I expect many of you have been, you will remember there are lying a number of stone tombs with recumbent marble figures of the crusaders of 500 years ago on the top. It was just about a month after Lord Allenby had entered Jerusalem, and someone with a high sense of the world responsibility and the effort of the British Empire said, "This is the first time after all these centuries, the only time, that the Crusaders, now their British successors have succeeded in carrying out what they set out to do 500 years ago. Let us show it!"—and they came and put green palms across the breasts of those stone crusaders. (Applause) That, Gentlemen, was the spirit of the British Nation.

Then another instance that had its rather humorous side was one I ran into in connection with my intelligence work in the east. You will remember that the Arabs, very much oppressed in Palestine, were always great people for prophecies. Anything that they can twist into a prophecy is a thing that they love to pass on. There arose a prophecy years ago, apparently in the days of the oppression by the Turks, when they never could see an end to it. There arose a prophecy to this effect,—"The Turkish rule will end, only when the waters of the Nile flow into the Jordan." Well, of course, that looked like an impossibility. But what happened? You will remember that as the British pushed their way across the desert, with the railway as their line of communication, they pushed alongside of the railway tracks an eight-inch iron water-pipe; that followed the troops, just as the railway did. After the battle of Gaza, in which Lord Allenby had such great success, the British advanced, got over the height of land and within sight of Jerusalem, and carried the water pipe line with them. Then suddenly the Arabs realized what had happened. You can depend upon it that the British concerned with that operation—and the Intelligence Department was not the least part of it—took every advantage of the situation, and there went through the enemies lines and the enemy's camps as quickly as wildfire the sudden realization that the prophecy had come true—the waters of the Nile were really flowing into the Jordan. (Laughter and applause)

The mandate for Palestine is rather a difficult one. We undertook to put the Jews back in Palestine. We undertook to make Palestine as Jewish as England is English; but I am not so sure that our people at home realized what it meant. I am not so sure that they realized all that it meant to the Arabs, because at the same time that our people's interests are to be safe-guarded, the interests of the Arabs must be safe-guarded. But the Arabs turned around and said, "We have lived here thousands of years; we lived here long before the Jews ever came here; it is our country; what are you going to do about it." That is a difficulty we have in Palestine. It is a protectorate; we have to protect it; we have to carry out that mandate. How it is going to be done is pretty difficult to say, but there is a prospect, and a reasonable one, that by British co-operation and adroitness they will be able to find a middle course between the Jews and the Arabs, and in the end get a reasonably stable government in which both will participate.

Now to Mesopotamia. There, too, we had a mandate. There are those of our enemies who said that we are after the oil. That may be, for it might be one of the means of helping us to recoup the great cost of the war in the east. But we must bear in mind that Mesopotamia is not a rich country; it is questionable whether its resources are what people think. We know there is oil, and that there are also great possibilities for agriculture after money is spent in irrigation works. The country is so large that we have found already, after an expenditure of ten millions of pounds for military occupation, that we cannot adequately hold it against outside aggression; and everyone knows that we have had to withdraw our armies. The inside history of it is that the thing is costing so much that it is a question how long it should be maintained; so now we are simply trying to police it, and you will have seen by the papers the other day that we are endeavouring to do it by means of airplanes. How that will succeed, who will know? But the whole point is that we will have to spend money and effort to get the Arabs to work, and to work with us. We will have to try to give them a stable government in which they themselves will be to a large extent the controlling factor. With that object, they were asked if they would not like to have a king, and they said, yes. The British said, "Who would you like to have?" The answer was found in Omar Feisal, from Syria, who had come in, and who is quite acceptable, for the most part, to the people of Mesopotamia.

I think I shall take the risk of prolonging my talk to tell a little story about that as well. At the time when our military work there was at its height it became necessary for a certain very influential Arab tribe to be approached by our people, to make sure that they would not throw their influence in with the enemy, and if possible that they would throw their influence in with us. The person who was selected to be the envoy to the Arab Sheik was a woman, a Scotch lady about 30 or 35 years old, who had been for many years in the foreign office, who had been out in India and the east, and who was familiar with Mesopotamia. She had been taken by the British Military Service back to the east, and was working in the Indian Intelligence Service. She was suddenly selected to go as the envoy to try to influence this Arab Shiek and his tribe. She went, and met the Arab Sheik at a rendezvous, and told him a lot of things about our situation, asked him a lot of questions, and created a certain psychological condition in his mind. She did not tell him, of course, that we were hard pressed neither did she tell him that we had a whole lot of reinforcements coming up—which was not the fact; but she left him to infer it; and with her woman's tactfulness she created an impression on this man's mind so that he went back to his tribe, made them a grand speech, and influenced his entire tribe to come in with us. (Applause) But the point of the story is this, that a year or more afterwards, when everything got cleared up and the inside history began to be known—which of course she did not know about—it was discovered that in this wonderful speech which the Arab Sheik made to his tribe out in the sands of the desert he told about the remarkable envoy which the British had sent, and he kept them in suspense for some time until finally he divulged to them that it was a woman; and as he watched the curling of their lips a little bit in derision, he described to them what a wonderful person she was; then he said, "Gentlemen, if their women are so marvellous my God, what must their men be?" (Laughter and applause)

Now to India. My time is going fast, and I am afraid I will not keep up to my time-table of forty minutes around the world. (Voices—"Go on") History shows that as far as the British underlying principles of government by the people are concerned, these have been observed for sixty or seventy years back, and in various periods of about ten years' interval there has been an impetus towards a new form or additional form of government. Lastly, in 1892, there came a period of very considerable expansion, and in 1912—twenty years later—after those years of trial, it was found that popular representation by the natives could influence the government of India but could not determine its policy. They discovered that, and the British knew it. Of course that was what caused the very considerable unrest just before the war. Then came the war, and with it a series of conditions which had very much accentuated the situation, as you have heard in the various addresses given before this Club in the last twelve months.

There were three principal causes. I think you will perhaps remember the way Mr. Rustomjee put this in speaking to the Club not long ago. He said that one cause was economic, another was religious, and the third was political. The economic cause was due primarily to the war—the depletion of supplies for the war in Mesopotamia and the east, and the various difficulties due to famine and monsoons by which prices of commodities rose. The religious causes were very complex. In the early days of the British occupation, in their endeavour to educate the people according to their policy, they ran counter to the feelings of the great educated class of India, the Brahmins, who had heretofore been the means of education. As the younger generation became educated, the Brahmins discovered the loss of their influence with the younger generation, and were consequently dissatisfied. That was one branch of the discontent. The other branch was the Mohammedan. When you remember that there are tens of millions of Mohammedans in India, and that they are part of a huge Mohammedan world which is centred in Europe, Africa and Asia, and when you remember that the Mohammedans constitute a body greater in the world than the Christians, you realize what that means to us of the British Empire. Mohammedans, for example, Turkey and Constantinople, in the great war, fought against British Empire troops from various parts of the world, including India. You can understand the attitude of the Mohammedan towards the British on the broad principle. After various inducements offered by the Germans, the Mohammedans believed that the great war was directed against the Moslem Church, and of course the result was obvious. They naturally sought how they could make it difficult for the British in India. As happens on such occasions, they sought the various bodies of discontent which were surrounding the British rule in India, and they immediately linked up the Brahmins and the Mohammedans—a curious combination of opposing forces united by a common danger.

Now, in fact, under such conditions with Constantinople and Turkey asserting their power, the situation becomes difficult, and they endeavour in various ways to regain their old prestige. The danger of that situation is quite obvious, from the fact that the Mohammedans have such a tremendous influence in the Near East.

Leaving that for a moment, and coming to the political causes, one has only to draw attention to the effort that has been made during the last few years, and particularly in 1919, by the British to give the people of India some measure of autonomous government. You will remember the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, and the endeavour to get legislative assemblies in the nine states, and the effort to get an arrangement whereby they should have a representative government in which seventy per cent. of the governing body should be native and the remainder British. From that experiment has, perhaps, arisen a certain amount of the friction of to-day, because the Indians themselves are finding that it is not quite as they had hoped. They are finding that, as before, they are not being entrusted with the financial features of the government, and consequently they have not the full control. Therein, probably, is the real difficulty in the political cause.

The processes at work in India are not only those that I have described, but other processes, of which Mr. Gandhi and his propaganda play a very important part. Mr. Gandhi is an educated gentleman, educated in England; a man of very high type. He is a recluse, and a pacifist, and they look upon him as Heaven-sent; therefore he is a dangerous type of agitator. During the past few months you have had a fine example of what he has been trying to do. He believes that through co-operation by the Indians themselves in passive resistance, by the process of boycott against Western ideas and ideals and against Western materials, and Western control, he is going to pull India out of its present situation and place it back in the situation in which it was 200 years ago. You remember how Mr. Joshi described that rather at length here a few weeks ago.

Now, the situation as it seems to be to-day, is not so bad as it would appear from reading some of our newspapers. There is a very deflnite propaganda on this continent against the British, and there are those who say that the things we are getting in our papers here are very much garbled, and do not give a true explanation of the situation. However that may be, the fact remains that a proof of the influence of Mr. Gandhi has been definitely exhibited during the last few weeks by the tour of the Prince of Wales in India. If you follow that, step by step, you will see that as each week succeeds each week, by the time the Prince of Wales got to Calcutta, which was considered to be the very hot bed of the Gandhi propaganda and agitation, practically the whole boycott, the whole idea of antagonism, had broken down at the command of the natives themselves. (Applause) Along with that comes this well-known fact that the Mohammedan and Hindoos are like oil and water, they will not mix; and so we come to see that it is quite likely that the Gandhi agitation will not succeed, that the Mohammedan and the Hindo coalition will not last. It remains for our people to follow consistently the process of government upon which they have embarked. I believe that by patience, by coolness, by good common sense, the British can control the destinies of India by keeping things on an even keel until the situation there will clear itself; and I think it is a sure expectation, which one hears on all sides, that India will not be lost to the Empire, but will stay in the hands of the British. If the British left India it would be the greatest disaster in the history of that people. (Applause)

Just a word about Africa. We have received a tremendous legacy in Africa as the result of the war. Before the war we had South Africa, Cape Colony to Rhodesia and East Africa, now known as Kenya. We have acquired German East Africa which is now called Tanganyika; and we shall acquire a portion of West Africa, also German, and we have various parts of the Interior such as Uganda, etc. Our problem there has been the problem of the original occupiers and of newcomers—in the South Coolies from India, Dutch farmers, English and natives; in the centre, the native and the British and the Arab traders. That, again, is a question of autonomy and the government of the country itself. It is not so far advanced as the other countries, and it has to be held in the hands of the British legislators for some years to come; but the prospects are that with money and with care those new countries will be gradually supplied with their requirements and a great deal of the discontent will end.

In that connection, I want to speak of a matter which has come to my own notice in Toronto. The Colonial Office is asking for Canadians of the right type to present themselves to go out to those newly acquired countries in Africa to take posts as administrators, as engineers, and as constructors of various kinds; and they have asked especially for University Graduates and Graduates in Applied Science and Engineering.

As to Australia, I think you have heard much about that country from various lectures before this Club. The great problem is that of a White Australia; they want to protect themselves against intrusion by the Yellow Races. That problem is much more acute with them than with us. They have had responsible government for many years. They have had a labour government, and the world has been learning from the government of Australia how a labour government carries on. It is for us, looking at it from the outside, to decide how they are really getting on.

We have now gone half way around the world, and we are ready to come home to Canada; and after all, Gentlemen, it is really Canada, our own country, and its place in the Empire, of which I want to speak. It is the last link in this trip around the world; the last long, thin link from ocean to ocean. In speaking of that, I want to draw your attention to the new Coat of Arms for the Dominion of Canada which is about to be adopted, if it is not already so; and the motto on that Coat of Arms is "A Mari Usque Ad Mare" from Sea to Sea. (Applause) What finer idea of Empire, applied as it is to Canada—from Atlantic to Pacific—what finer idea of Empire could we have than that motto "From Sea to Sea"? I think, Gentlemen, that shows to us how necessary it is for us to continue our place in the Empire, to form that link from Sea to Sea; Canada, the great golden link—the great link, golden in Industry, golden in Opportunity, golden in Resources, and golden in Loyalty—to bind the Empire together through the Seven Seas. (Loud applause) For this Loyalty it is the high duty of this Empire Club and of the Canadian Clubs and the Rotary and other Clubs throughout the country to talk, to preach, to live and to act in all places and at all times. (Hear, hear)

Our Canadian problems are not the same as the others. We have gone through our period of questioning and the trial to our autonomy. We have gone through our various forms and our struggles for responsible government years ago. But the problem that we have before us to-day is how we are going to carry out that idea of autonomy up to a certain point and then apply it in that great intimate partnership in the Empire and the British League of Nations. That is the problem that we have before us—how we are going to take our place in that intimate League of Nations of the British Empire.

But we have other problems—problems which are a legacy of the war—with which we are now struggling; and in that struggle we have learned the extent of our imperial resources, and the extent and quality of our human resources, and of these we are proud. The problems to-day are mainly those of population, transportation, national finance and stabilization. The immediate problems before us are such as those of employment, tariff, and so on. All those problems we must face with courage—courage of the kind that only Canadians and Anglo-Saxons can appreciate; and if I may again refer to our friends of the Rotary Club I would like to draw to your attention a slogan with which they have placarded this city—many of you have seen it—"You can have prosperity if you are willing to pay for it with Faith, Work and Co-operation." (Applause)

Now, at the beginning of another year—three years after the war—we must face these problems cheerfully. Cheerfulness and courage are the characteristics of the British and of the Anglo-Saxon race; and I would like to draw to your attention what the Prince of Wales said—our own Prince of Wales—at the meeting of the Chamber of Commerce in London last July:

> "At any rate there is one thing I feel, and that is that our duty at the present moment is that of cheerfulness I think all of us acknowledge that in spite of everything the men from the Old Country and those who came over from the Dominions, kept cheery during the war, and I am quite sure that went a long way to help us in winning through, and I feel exactly the same at the present moment.

Why should we not be cheerful? Why should we not be cheery to-day, the first month of this New Year? Think of all the things which, in the Empire and in Canada, we have to be thankful for. I am not trying to speak platitudes; I am trying to bring it down to the day and to the hour in the Empire. The Limitation of Arms Conference is progressing, and as I said before, we have every hope of peace and stabilization for years to come. The Irish Question appears all but finally and peacefully settled. Economic conditions improve daily in the

Old Country and over the Empire generally. We are getting back in the Empire to our old commercial and shipping conditions. We are now on the way to stabilizing the economic conditions of Europe, as witness the coming Conference in the Riviera next month. Sterling Exchange in New York has decreased sixty cents since last January. That means a great deal in Empire Trade.

Now turn to Canada. Why should we not be cheerful? Everyone agrees, and we see it everywhere in the papers during the last few days and weeks, that financial conditions are more stable. Forced liquidation in trade and industry is about complete. The cost of living is approaching the normal, if you may consider it normal before or early in the War. Unemployment will largely decrease with the stabilization of trade. There is betterment in the labour situation. Agricultural products, although they have been at a low price, will undoubtedly force down the cost of production. Canadian exchange in New York is again close to normal. A year ago it was 18 per cent. To-day it is only six per cent. The turmoil of the Dominion Elections is over and now everybody is getting busy to meet and attack the problems that we have before us. Why shouldn't we be cheerful?

But the great Empire problem for Canada is the general one of her place in the Empire. The links of Empire must change in their character. We have always thought of the links of Empire in terms of sentiment, to a certain degree, and during the last few years we have thought about the terms of Blood which were shed in the war; but now the British Empire has to be held together by something else, something more material. It must be held together by good common sense and by hard every-day business. Again I turn to what the Prince of Wales said on that same occasion before the London Chamber of Commerce. Later on in the same speech he said:

> "We need not ask any questions about British Enterprise and I think another thing we can be certain of is that we

are a people of common sense. Common sense implies a frank and straight recognition of facts, a spirit of give and take and making the best of things, ... If I were called on for a toast I should give you "The British Empire and British Common Sense."

So said the Prince of Wales, and now, Gentlemen, I ask you what is Canada's best line of action? What is Canada's function? What is our duty to the Empire? I submit that it is first to determine what is best for the Empire, and with that, what is best for Canada, and how we can fit it into what is best for the Empire. That is the way to put it, and not the other way; and we should mould our policy of Canada to the policy of the Empire, for the good of Canada and for the good of the Empire. It is our duty to trade within the Empire, to help our co-partners in the scheme, and to take our place in the great British League of Nations. It is for us to maintain our British Empire ideals, our ideals and sentiments, and to resist any influences from within or without which tend to break down those ideals. That, I think, Gentlemen, is one of the most important functions which we as Canadians, which we as an Empire Club, have to fulfil—to resist those influences, whether from the inside or the outside. It is our Empire; it is yours and mine; we have lived in it, we have fought for it; now let us live for it; let us work for it; keep it together, bind it tighter, and then be able to hand it down to our successors as a greater and better Empire than it has been before. I thank you, Gentlemen. (Loud applause)

* * * *

Dr. Goggin read the report of the nominating committee and moved that the list be accepted as the officers for the coming year.

On motion of Mr. Norman Sommerville, the President cast a ballot for the list as read, and they were declared elected.

Dr. Goggin announced that the three members elected by the past presidents were Messrs. Coombs, Stapells and Fetherstonhaugh.

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, 1922

President: Sir William Hearst, K.C.
First Vice-President: Mr. Ellis H. Wilkinson
Second Vice-President: Mr. S. R. Parsons
Third Vice-President: Mr. W. J. Darby
Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. D. J. Goggin

COMMITTEE

Mr. Harold Baldwin
Mr. W. H. Banfield
Dr. Harold Clark
Dr. J. Murray Clark, K.C.
Dr. P. E. Doolittle
Mr. H. G. Fox
Mr. W. Claude Fox
Mr. A. E. Gilverson
Mr. A. Monro Grier, K.C.
Mr. J. B. Hanna
Mr. C. D. Henderson
Mr. Arthur Hewitt
Lt.-Col. A. E. Kirkpatrick
Mr. A. O. Hogg
Mr. W. E. Lemon
Mr. George H. Smith
Mr. J. B. Sutherland
Brig.-Gen. C. H. Mitchell

and the three members elected by the Past Presidents.

Mr. Arthur Hewitt said it had been customary to pass a vote of thanks to the speaker of the day, and the custom should be followed in the case of President Mitchell's address which had been so interesting, so full of thoughts and information and history. He therefore moved a vote of thanks to the retiring President for his admirable address.

The Motion was put by the Secretary and carried amid applause.

General Mitchell thanked the members of the Club for their vote, adding that he completed his term as President with great regret, but welcomed his successor, Sir William Hearst with great pleasure. He then introduced Sir William Hearst, the newly elected President who expressed his thanks for his election and outlined his plans for the coming year.